THE ALTERNATIVE

Prettiness: the Rationale for Lindsay; page 3

Vol. 5 No. 7 25¢ April, 1972

KING and *DOCKSAI*: rebuttal to *The Alternative*.
WITONSKI: memo to the Ripon Society.
MILSTEIN: a case for socialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ALTERNATIVE

to bare the witness and the truth.

CONTENTS

DEPARTMENTS

The Continuing Crisis 2
Letter from a Whig: George F. Will 15
The Bootblack Stand: Letters from Hamill and Geyelin 19
Correspondence: Letters from Kaplan and McGuinness.....21
Current Wisdom: by Assorted Jackasses 22

ARTICLES

John Moscow: John Lindsay — Prettiness in Politics 3
Dr. Edward A. Hacker: Professionalism vs. Student Power....4
Peter P. Witonski: A Memo to the Ripon Society 5
Tom Milstein: What Is Socialism and Will It Work?.....6
Dan Joy: Palmists and Scholarship 10
George Charles RocheIII: In the Public Interest. 15
Jerry Gerde: A Note from the Provinces 21

REBUTTALS TO THE ALTERNATIVE

Dr. John D. King, M.D.: In Defense of the Sawbone 12
R. Frederick Docksai: You Won't Have Civilization to Kick Around Anymore 13

REVIEWS

Douglas W. Cooper on *Communist China, 1949-1968* 16
John P. East on *The Basic Symbols of the American Political Tradition* 17
David Brudnoy on *The American Theatre, 1969-1970* 18
Kevin S. Olson on *A Clockwork Orange* 20

Published remarkably without regard to race, color, creed, or (most redundantly of all) national origin — the question of sex is still in committee.

Editor-in-Chief: R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.
Publisher: Baron Von Kannon and the Saturday Evening Club
Managing Editor: Joseph A. Morris
Circulation Manager: Ronald E. Burr
Senior Editors: Terry Krieger
William Kristol ☐ Rev. George Nathan
Associates: David Brudnoy
Jameson G. Campaigne, Jr. ☐ Doug Cooper
John R. Coyne, Jr. ☐ Jefferson Davis
C. H. Simonds ☐ Roger D. Tyrrell
Contributors: John Avey ☐ Paul Bernstein
Frank W. Blatchford III ☐ Barry Burr
David Friedman ☐ Jerry Gerde ☐ Lynn German
Sandy Houlle ☐ Wayne Johnson ☐ John Kelley
John Moscow ☐ Gary North ☐ Mark Souder
John Sundt ☐ David Tudor
Sir Arthur Wellesley ☐ Timothy Wheeler
Alien Contributors: Eric Brodin ☐ Judy Tyrrell
Art: Eric Lohnaas ☐ Sandy Weeder

The Alternative was founded in 1924 by George Nathan and Truman Newberry over a cheap domestic beer in McSorley's Old Ale House. Originally published on restroom walls, only since 1967 has it come under purview of the Saturday Evening Club which publishes it from October through June. Subscriptions cost $4.00, and all correspondence (manuscripts, subscriptions, threatening letters, federal grants, etc.) should be sent to **The Alternative**, c-o The Establishment, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, Continental U.S.A.

Copyright **The Alternative** Magazine 1972

changing your address?

Please attach the address label from the back cover of your Alternative in the space below. Print your new address and mail this form to The Alternative. Important: allow five weeks for address change. Always attach address label when writing to us about your subscription.

THE ALTERNATIVE,
CIRCULATION DEPT.,
R.R. 11, BOX 360,
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA
47401

☐ Please renew my subscription for one year. Enclosed is my check ($2.00 for students and faculty, $4.00 others).

name
address
city
state
zip

Please Place Address Label Here

The Continuing Crisis

● In Egypt youthful idealists are demanding immediate war with Israel, while in New Jersey, state education commissioner, Carl L. Morburger, is ordering the Newark school board to "desist" from flying the Black Nationalist flag in Newark schools.

● From Moscow comes word that the Soviet establishment is having its troubles — this time with ideologically slovenly artists and drunken ice skaters in Gorky Park. And the Berrigan brothers, an American peace group, has been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize.

● On February 21 President Nixon departed Washington for a one-week stay in Red China where he pursued peace. At Peking Airport a dapper Chou En-lai led a welcoming committee which — much to the surprise of American news commentators — was composed of few women and fewer blacks.

● According to the New China News Service that big dinosaur fossile found in east China in 1964 has definitely been identified as a species of the duck-billed dinosaur that lived 100,000 years ago. Angela Davis was released on bail and the House passed and sent to the Senate a bill repealing some dated laws proscribing traffic in Chinese coolies.

● Crime continues to be a problem. On February 10 Mr. Randolph Wells informed police that three men forcibly entered his Oildale, California home, bound him, throttled him and attempted to make him eat a live, two-foot snake. He resisted, and twenty dollars were stolen from his billfold. Mr. Bilboro C. Fauce of Brooklyn was nabbed in a larcenous act. It was later discovered that for months he has been pilfering women's underwear from Brooklyn laundromats, dying it green and sending it to Mr. Pete Hamill, the New York *Post* columnist. Abandoning all restraint, Miss Nude America, Valerie Craft, cavorted wantonly on a Chicago stage before an agape but legally impotent audience of Chicago police. It was not until the Chicago fire marshall arrived that the show ended, but by then Miss Craft had brazenly scandalized the pick of Chicago's virtue patrol. And in San Francisco, Sgt. Carl Percheid, the world's oldest motorcycle policeman, retired at the age of seventy, having exhausted eleven motorcycles in his forty-seven year career.

● On February 4, the sixth round of the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) concluded. Indiana University's David Hoffman finally did break the world record for the longest recorded indoor shower. (The outdoor record was established by a four-year-old orangutan in Central Borneo during the famous rainy season of 1956.) The fiery Irish Stateswoman, Bernadette Devlin, punched Home Secretary Reginald Maudling during a debate in Parliament. The settlement of the West Coast

(continued on page 11)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John Lindsay — Prettiness in Politics

John Moscow

OVER THE YEARS he has been in public office John V. Lindsay has been called many names, ranging from the unprintable to the idolatrous. He has had massive public exposure as the most glamorous Mayor of the nation's most glamorous city; he is currently running for President of these United States. In the interests of fair play and honest journalism it behooves us to examine the Lindsay record to see what makes this man such a uniquely qualified candidate for the nation's highest office. On the basis of his record we can see what sort of administration we would have were John Lindsay President.

Obviously we would have a beautiful administration. John Lindsay is the prettiest candidate to receive serious attention in the Presidential races in a long, long time. His staff are very much like him in that regard; although they lack the natural beauty that is his, they too have the style that goes with working in Madison Avenue public relations and advertising firms. We could be assured of having pictures of nothing but exceptionally attractive cabinet officers, together with their beautiful boss, on the television picture tube in the evenings. That would be a great improvement over current pictures of the dead in Vietnam, or depressing economic graphs.

There are serious political advantages to having a beautiful President, aside from the important domestic lift in morale that Lindsay's beautiful profile would bring every evening. As must be obvious to everyone, women are playing an ever more prominent role in world affairs. Women already rule countries in difficult trouble spots like India, Ceylon — important for its naval bases in the Indian Ocean — and Israel. It will surely help our national position to have a beautiful President talking with the women leaders of such countries; Kosygin is hardly any competition.

Apart from the advantages of having a beautiful President, we could be sure that a Lindsay administration would have good taste and style. We would not have to suffer the agonies that many of us went through when it was revealed that Lyndon Johnson liked barbecues — so gross and gooey. We will not have to smart under the knowledge that our President admires football heroes. John Lindsay is above such things. We will, instead, be able to rest assured that JVL, as his aides affectionately refer to him, will seek a revival of lawn tennis as the national sport. It is merely a question of taste, but questions of taste are sometimes important. If the United States wants to prove to the rest of the world that we are not a rough, tough bunch of barbarians we will have to project a more elegant image. Clearly such games as tennis, without the old-fashioned body contact implicit in such grubby games as football, are far more in line with our noble image; no one is better qualified to lead a change in national style than John Lindsay.

As for economics, surely John Lindsay's credentials here are exemplary. In an age where budget deficits are popular John Lindsay has shown himself a master of the unbalanced budget. Not merely does Lindsay come up with unbalanced budgets — as other presidential candidates have done — but he has hidden current expenses away in the capital construction budget. Thus New Yorkers have learned that job training programs and school books are capital expenditures, like bridges and schools. With Lindsay as President the United States will not only lead the world in the size of the governmental deficit, it will have the most imaginative budgets anywhere. Whereas currently we complain about how much money various departments spend, we will not complain when Lindsay is President, because *we will not know.*

More to the point, with Lindsay as President we will be able to remedy the balance of payments problem. Lindsay will simply ask the United Nations for aid, showing them that if other nations did not ship their goods here we would not have a balance of payments problem.

To back him as President John Lindsay would undoubtedly appoint a marvelous cabinet. As Mayor of New York his selections were the worst since Caligula made his horse Consul in the decadence of the Roman Empire. We were all amazed by the poor background investigations President Nixon had made on his defeated Supreme Court nominees. Lindsay would never have a background investigation made.

One of the most attractive of the Lindsay Cabinet appointees was James Marcus — a good tennis player, and phony who was in debt to the Mafia. No sooner did Lindsay give Marcus one of the top ten jobs in the city than Marcus made a crooked contract with a mafioso contractor.

Lindsay learned from the furor resulting from the Marcus investigation that background investigations were necessary. More important, he learned that appointees had to be expert in their line of work. With that background, in his successful endeavor to outdo Caligula, he appointed Mr. Anthony Scotto to a position on the New York Waterfront Commission.

The Waterfront Commission is a special group in New York. It was established a quarter of a century ago to fight corruption and thefts on the waterfront, as they were threatening to strangle the entire Port of New York. At that time the chief crook was a man named Albert Anastasia. Given Mafia inheritance patters, and the passage of time, "Tony" Scotto, who is Anastasia's son-in-law, now is chief crook on the waterfront. Lindsay claims that he did not know that Mr. Anthony Scotto and Tony Scotto were the same person, but it certainly thrilled the hearts of the honest longshoremen to know that their Tony was going to regulate their behavior.

John Lindsay has a special strength as a presidential candidate that would serve him well, for a while, as president. He has *chutzpah* — a very special kind of nerve. *(Chutzpah* is the quality shown by the man who, having been convicted of murdering his wife and children, pleads for mercy on the grounds that he is a widower, and childless.) John Lindsay runs best by claiming as his special strength his greatest weaknesses. Since he has so many weaknesses, he makes the most extravagant of claims, and few people believe that the Hitler-Stalin technique of the "Big Lie" is still in use today. It makes some of the New Yorkers nostalgic for the good old days of the 1930s.

Although John Lindsay has a poor record as Mayor, it is because, as he will undoubtedly be willing to tell you, New York City is absolutely ungovernable. I am not sure how he knows, as he has never tried to govern New York, but who am I to doubt him? I remember, in January of 1970, walking through City Hall Park in New York on the day the Mayor was being inaugurated the second time. I had trouble walking, because there had been a snowstorm a week earlier, and the snow had not been cleared from in front of City Hall.

I had gone down to City Hall with a friend to see if we could go into the museum in City Hall, but it was closed, for security reasons. I went back six months later, but courageous Mayor Lindsay had closed that museum to the public. The last I heard of the Mayor's courage he had installed bullet proof glass in City Hall, in addition to the many policemen on duty, the fact that City Hall is now closed to the public, and the existence of a burglar-alarm system. Everyone who wants to visit the White House should hurry up and visit there before John Lindsay takes office; the courageous Mayor will undoubtedly close it.

These are the Lindsay strengths: now for his weaknesses.... □

ROUGH BEAST is: Politics without ideology • Social commentary • Committed to the truth • The organ of family, community, the permanent values in life • "The most original journal of ideas on the American scene in recent years," according to Prof. Robert Nisbet. 50¢ for two trial issues:

ROUGH BEAST

Dept A, 1522 Conn. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Charnel Halls of Ivy

Professionalism vs. Student Power

Dr. Edward A. Hacker

THERE ARE CERTAIN academic matters such as teaching, curricula, examinations, grading, etc., which traditionally have been the prerogative of the faculty. Lately this prerogative has been challenged, for it is now considered fashionable, by a certain vocal minority, to have undergraduates teach credit courses, to have students grade themselves in some courses and to have students as voting members of curriculum committees of departments and colleges.

It is understandable why some students should agitate for academic privileges hitherto regulated by faculty. After all, teaching a course is more of an "ego-trip" than taking one. Self-grading (how many students give themselves "D's" or "F's") assures a passing grade. And rubbing elbows with faculty at a curriculum meeting gives the warm feeling of egalitarianism.

What is not understandable, on rational grounds, is why some faculty condone and even encourage these unorthodox, unnecessary and unprofessional practices. The unorthodox is welcome, if its superiority over the orthodox is demonstrable; the unnecessary is bearable, if it is innocuous; but unprofessional practices within a profession cannot be justified by either love or logic.

By talking to faculty who favor giving undergraduates professional privileges, I have found that their arguments fall into three categories, which I name: (i) The Argument from Democracy, (ii) The Argument from Communication and (iii) The Argument from Relevancy. I shall critically address myself to each argument.

The Argument from Democracy

This is a favorite argument of those who champion student power. It is used to justify student-taught courses, self-grading and student voting membership on both academic and administrative committees. The argument comes in two forms. The first form is, "Since this is a democratic country, every institution in it should be democratically governed; therefore, colleges should be democratically governed, which means that students should share power with faculty and administration." This argument commits the fallacy of division, since it assumes that what is true of the country, as a whole, must be true of every institution within the country. This assumption is false, since it is perfectly possible (and, indeed, is generally the case) that the type of government which determines the policies of a country need not be the type of government which determines the policies of institutions within that country.

The second version of The Argument from Democracy goes something like this: "Colleges should be democratically governed and a basic principle of democratic government is egalitarianism; therefore, students being equals to faculty and administration should share their power." This argument goes astray in assuming that the principle of democratic egalitarianism means that all people are equal in knowledge and experience. Knowledge cannot be conferred by definition.

The general refutation of all versions of The Argument from Democracy consists in asserting that colleges are not, and should not be, democratic institutions, and in revealing the absurdity in the argument that a democratic form of government is one in which non-professionals are competent to make professional decisions. No form of government can *ipso jure* make ignorance equal to knowledge, inexperience equal to experience, or folly equal to wisdom.

The Argument from Communication

This argument is generally used to support student voting membership on academic and administrative committees. It goes like this: "Communication between students and faculty, and students and administration, is academically important; therefore, students should have voting membership on all committees of their choice." The premise of this argument has merit, since effective two-way communication between the three factions of a college is a prerequisite for sound education. However, the conclusion of this argument is a *non sequitur*. When this fallacy is pointed out an *ad hoc* argument is invariably given to remedy the situation, which generally takes this form: "If students aren't given voting membership on committees of their choice, then they will be resentful and will not communicate with faculty and administration." For the vast majority of students, I do not believe this statement is true. Students are never reluctant to express their opinions to faculty or administration when they know that their opinions are seriously being sought. The judgment that students have to be bribed to communicate indicates a view of the student body as morally askewed as it is false.

In general The Argument from Communication is refuted by pointing out that voice and vote are not necessary correlates. It is desirable to have both formal and informal channels of communication between students and faculty, but such channels of communication should not become pathways to power.

The Argument from Relevancy

This argument is based on the assumption that the interests of students should be given priority in all educational matters, especially curricula matters. This argument usually takes the following form: "College and department curricula are not relevant to students' interests; therefore, students, in order to bring about the required reforms, must have voting membership on all curriculum committees."

Reading and experience have revealed to me that students' interests, currently in vogue, fall into three categories: Mystical, Experiential and Social. Their mystical interests are shown by their fascination with astrology, tarot cards and other magical devices. Their experiential interests are shown by their concern with drugs, sex and the participatory aspects of religion, communes and 'togetherness' groups. Their social interests range over such topics as ecology, politics and problems of social justice.

In my opinion it would be a travesty on college education to teach courses in astrology, tarot cards, etc., simply because some students have an interest in such irrationalities. There is, and should be, a relevancy gap between college curricula and systematized superstitions, unless one is asking for a return to the Dark Ages, a request no rational person would seriously consider.

Should college curricula be altered to meet the students' need for meaningful and significant interpersonal relationships? I think not, since a college classroom is not a psychological clinic, nor is the instructor a trained psychological counsellor. I am in no way denying that the lack of such relationships is a serious problem for many students (as well as for others in our society), but I am denying that the classroom, in a course in sociology, philosophy, history, etc., should become an encounter group or a "rap session" in which the personal problems of the students are discussed. If a student's personal problems are of such a nature that he feels compelled to discuss them in every classroom situation, then he should seek qualified psychiatric help, instead of advocating that the curriculum be changed to meet his needs. The tail should not wag the dog.

Some students are correct when they complain that college education is irrelevant to their needs, but the converse then must be also true, their needs are irrelevant to college education.

Perhaps the most common complaint the advocators of student power have is the irrelevancy of college curricula to their social and political interests. This complaint formerly baffled me, for I could not think of a single course in humanities or sciences that was not relevant to understanding our present culture and civilization. I am no longer baffled, since subsequently I have learned what students mean by social and political relevancy. "Relevancy," to the students who use this word as a slogan, does not mean that which helps us to understand current issues. These students think they know what the issues are; they have no use for under-

(continued on page 23)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ALTERNATIVE April 1972

A Memo to the Ripon Society on the Death of American Liberalism

Peter P. Witonski

WHAT FOLLOWS are some short and hastily contrived thoughts on an event of great significance for what used to be called the "Liberal Wing" of the Republican Party; an event which, I hasten to add, has been assiduously ignored by the daily press, which has had more important things to concern itself with. To wit, the death of American Liberalism. Yes, you heard me correctly: *the death of American Liberalism!* Not only has nobody bothered to write about this important event, nobody really seems to care very much. The passing of American Liberalism has evoked no mourning among its former disciples, no eloquent panegyrics, not even a doleful obituary in the New York *Times*. Burke's words about the passing of Whiggery come to mind, "What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue."

All this may have something to do with the nature of the Liberal beast. Ideologically speaking, Liberalism — despite its long hegemony in the Democratic Party — has always been alien to our political tradition; and, notwithstanding the ingenious efforts of the Ripon Society, it has never succeeded in gaining a foothold on the Republican Party, where the appellation "Liberal-Republican" has always been considered, in William Buckley's now famous *bon mot*, to be "oxymoronic." This is not to say that Liberalism has not played a constructive role in the political history of other nations, such as Great Britain; it is simply to emphasize that it has played no such role in America. Like Toryism, Monarchism, Fascism and Utopian Socialism, Liberalism belongs to the ideological history of Europe, and hence, in its pristine form, it can never be American, and can only do intellectual damage to our political system, as students of politics have begun to notice in recent years.

Lest the reader accuse me of anti-Liberalism, I will note that I have the greatest possible respect for the Liberal tradition, at least in its European manifestation, which, I believe, has produced a brilliant and often persuasive body of thought. But when this classical Liberalism was exported to America it became something quite different from the ideology articulated by its progenitors: it became *American* Liberalism. The Liberalism that grew up in American soil, that Liberalism which I have described as being alien to our culture, was a corrupted Liberalism that owed much more to our native self-righteousness than to the political philosophy advanced by the 19th-century Classicists. As a people we have always viewed ourselves and our political system as being about as perfect as anything on God's Earth. Indeed, we have depicted ourselves, and our country, as God's Elect. We are, in short, the embodiment of the Weberian Protestant Ethic and all that it has come to stand for. So when Liberalism came to America, it was quickly Calvinized, and the resulting ideology had very little in common with, say, John Stuart Mill or Adam Smith. What developed in its place was an ill-considered amalgam of Goodman Brown-like Protestantism, old-fashioned imperialism (always put in its best light: i.e., the White Man's burden, et.al.), and a kind of watered-down social democratic economics; and it is this intellectual hodge-podge that we Americans have called Liberalism.

From the very beginning this unique American Liberalism carried within itself the seeds of its ultimate destruction; but as long as it gave the impression that it was doing a good job (something which it succeeded in doing for many years), there was nothing that could stand in its way, however preposterous its claims and promises. Anyone bold enough to venture even a mild critique was consigned to Coventry with the greatest possible dispatch, as Barry Goldwater discovered in 1964. Our native brand of Liberalism seemed to many (including many Republicans) to be invincible. As one Eastern Republican put it: "Who can argue with an ideology that has vowed to make the world safe for Democracy, to end poverty and racialism at home and abroad, and to spread the American way of life as far as it can be extended?" "American Liberalism is not Liberal," declared a leading French political journalist. "It is not even imperialistic, *it is Coca-Colaist*," he concluded, somewhat flippantly. What we Americans considered to be good and altruistic, the rest of the world considered to be, again in the words of a French writer, "the American Challenge."

In a very real sense it was Franklin Roosevelt who did the most to firmly establish Liberalism as our dominent ideology, although, as Sigmund Freud has reminded us in a remarkable study of an American Liberal politician, adumbrations of this Liberalism could be observed in the pathological behavior of Woodrow Wilson during and after World War I. The rise of American Liberalism had as much to do with the circumstances Roosevelt encountered upon becoming President — circumstances which led him to reject the platform of his own party — as it did with the break-up of the great Republican coalition forged by President William McKinley and Mark Hanna in the 1890s. It was Roosevelt who introduced into our politics the dictum, "Where there is an *American* governmental will, there *must* be an American governmental *way*." This amazing postulate was applied with equal vigor both domestically and internationally, and well sums up the interventionist mode of political behavior that has marked our politics until the present day. There were no limits to intervention, and FDR intervened with greater zeal than any previous American President. He intervened in the economy of the nation, and brilliantly succeeded in creating the impression that he was successfully fighting the Great Depression that had brought him to power in the first place. That he failed to end the Depression, as Milton Friedman has reminded us in his essay "The Great Contraction," is now universally accepted by historians and economists — but that was not very important at the time. The important thing was that Roosevelt succeeded in convincing millions of Americans that he had in fact done something to end the Depression, and by so doing he not only established Liberalism as our reigning ideology, he also established the Democratic Party as our dominant political party.

In foreign affairs, Roosevelt led us to victory against fascism in World War II — once again, to make the world safe for Democracy. The war was supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people, and this too helped Roosevelt's cause, since the war was also fought in the name of Liberalism. It is not surprising therefore that for many years a majority of Americans viewed Liberalism as being *good* and conservatism, the ideology of the Republican Party, as being bad. The term conservative became such a bad one during the New Deal that many genuine conservatives, like Robert Taft, refused to accept it as being descriptive of their position, and called themselves "*true* Liberals."

If an American was unconvinced that Liberal interventionism was indeed good for him, Roosevelt's successor, Harry Truman — at least in foreign affairs — rammed the point home in his own earthy style. America emerged from World Warr II as the most powerful nation in the history of mankind, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we were thus in a position to do just about as we pleased, which, in fact, we proceeded to do with some success. Our foreign policy was well-intentioned, and full of Liberal idealism, and such programs as the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Berlin airlift (to name but a few), all served to enhance the standing of interventionism on a grand scale as practiced by Liberal planners in Washington. Where there was an American governmental will, there was an American governmental way. In the post-war world there were few who could muster the strength to argue with that presumption.

To be sure, there were those, during the period of the Liberal ascendency, with more critical dispositions, who dissented from the prevailing trend, who objected to Wilson's sanctimoniousness and Roosevelt's grand design; who argued with Truman that our unique political system could not easily be translated into different cultures; who maintained, in short, that there were limits to intervention. But since most of these critics were conservative Republicans in the tradition of Henry Cabot Lodge the Elder, they often failed to attract the kind of attention they deserved. Conservatives, you must remember, did not have a good press. One recalls, somewhat sadly, the visceral reaction in the early 1950s to Senator Robert Taft's incisive critique of our Korean involvement as being somehow typical of the treatment conservative critics of American Liberalism received in those now distant days; and it is not surprising that Republicans of that old dispensation found it difficult to get reelected.

The Korean intervention was a watershed for American Liberalism. It paved the way for the apotheosis of American Liberalism — the "crusade for freedom" in Vietnam. At the time of our initial involvement in Korea many conservative Republicans held their ground and followed the lead of Senator Taft in condemning the war as unconstitutional. But many more Republicans, under mounting pressure from their constituencies and from the Liberal-dominated press, began to move closer to the interventionist views of the Liberals. This is most apparent in foreign policy, but it is also obvious, as followers of the Ripon Society know too well, in the area of domestic policy. With the passing of Taft and his followers from the political scene, the conversion became almost complete, and some Republicans went so far as to try to out-Lib the Liberals—again, mainly in the area of foreign policy. The argument was simple, and, up to a point, very cogent and very plausible: Communism was a genuine threat to the survival of the Christian West; we Americans were God's Elect; therefore it was our duty to stop, or at least to contain, Communism. Taftism ceased to personify Republican conservatism, and was succeeded by an outlook not very different from Liberalism. By the time President John F. Kennedy vowed to liberate the world in his messianic inaugural address, his wildly interventionist views had become the views of just about every major American political figure, from Hubert Humphrey to Barry Goldwater.

The reasons for this conservative conversion, I think are quite simple. As Russell Kirk put it in the early fifties, the conservatives had been routed by the Liberals, and many of them were forced to adopt aspects of Liberal policy for reasons of survival. In terms of domestic policy this argument was well stated by Senator Brooke, when he maintained that his particular brand of Liberal Republicanism would differ from the Liberalism of the Democratic Party not in outlook or in the ends which it served, but only in the means to which it realized those ends. The Republicans, he suggested, can be better Liberals than the Democrats simply because they are, by nature, better managers. When Senator Goldwater ventured to differ with this school of thought in 1964, he was quickly disposed of, and declared to be a dangerous fanatic, reeking of the 18th century. With the defeat of Goldwater, the way was cleared for the hideous conflict in Vietnam.

Future historians, no doubt, will say that the Vietnam War was inspired by the good intentions of two exceedingly Liberal Presidents who really wanted to make the world safe for democracy. They will also add that it was a war that transformed America and led to the Death of American Liberalism. As our casualties mounted, and as dissent escalated at home, many Americans, for the first time, began to doubt that our will was still strong enough to get us our way. Indeed, the very self-righteousness of our entire Liberal policy began to fall into doubt. The ashes of the great wave of New Frontier and Great Society social legislation could be seen smouldering in the riot-torn streets of Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles and Newark. Campus unrest, political division and an incipient breakdown in public morals began to lead many Americans, including Liberal Americans, to question the very premises of American Liberalism. Strange things began to happen. Daniel Moynihan denouced Liberalism before a meeting of the A.D.A.; journals such as *Commentary* began to echo the views of *National Review;* and a new Left that held no respect for our traditional values began to emerge. It became clear, by the time of the 1968 election that interventionist Liberalism had had its day.

Some leading Liberals of the Kennedy-Johnson years began to adopt positions traditionally held by conservatives. One thinks of Nathan Glazer, Norman Podhoretz and Daniel Moynihan; others began to move away from the old Liberalism, but in the direction of a kind of deideologized radicalism, repeating in a watered-down form, many of the cliches of the New Left. One thinks of Robert Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy and George McGovern. As of this present writing there are only two disciples of the old American Liberalism with any importance in the Democratic Party, and they are not very important.

The point of all this is simple. I would suggest that Liberalism is not the future of the Republican Party, both because it is alien to our party, and because it is politically moribund. What then is our Party's future? The answer to this question is simple: Conservatism, as exemplified by the present Administration, and by the overwhelming conservative prejudice of the American people. If the Republican Party looks to its past, to its own traditions, it will not only be able to regain the power and influence it held in the days of McKinley, but it will be able to guide America to a happy and constructive future, devoid of the kind of adventurism and domestic and international meddling that marked the years following the New Deal. President Nixon, I believe, is doing a good job both for the nation and the party. He deserves the support, not only of the Ripon Society, but of the American conservative establishment. □

What Is Socialism and Will It Work?

Tom Milstein

What follows is the final essay in our symposium: Socialism vs. Capitalism, Which Way Progress. What moved us to such an elaborate exploration of economic systems was the conviction that, when the nation's abundant and magniloquent dissent movements are denatured of their jibberish, what remains is either a puny lump of nothing or, in the cases of those few movements based on palpable issues, a question of political economy or the organization of resources.

Now the discussion of puny nothingness constitutes the literary regimen of journals like **Ramparts** *and the gazettes from the louse underground. Their intellectually desolate pages abound with anguished revelations about various daydreams and favored spooks. Better things are expected of this distinguished intellectual digest, and so we devoted our last number to this matter of political economy, featuring essays on the free market, contemporary capitalism and socialism. We now conclude this symposium with the case for democratic socialism, by Tom Milstein, a member of the Young People's Socialist League.*

— RET

SOCIALISM IS a movement based on the working classes of capitalist societies, which aims to abolish human exploitation through the creation of a classless society.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialism climaxes a great drama in Western history whose theme is man's struggle to liberate himself from oppression by expropriating and bringing under his own control the instruments of his oppression.

This drama has its roots in Greek civilization and the Judaeo-Christian tradition, in the peculiar dynamism which these two currents have bequeathed to Western man and in the sequence of progressive evolution which they have imparted, however halting and interrupted, to his social institutions and culture. The current act in this drama opened with the French Revolution; it will not conclude until socialism is realized on a worldwide basis.

Prior to the French Revolution, political power, the means of coercion in society, was exclusively exercised by a hereditary elite called the aristocracy. The aristocracy of feudalism possessed political power as its "private property." The transformation of France from a monarchy into a republic expropriated political power from the aristocratic ruling class and transferred it, at least nominally, to the people through the institution of the democratic state. The democratic state, which derives its legitimacy from the consent of those whom it rules, "collectivized" what formerly had been the private property of the aristocracy: state power, the legitimate right to employ force.

Socialists regard the emergence of the democratic republic, with its associated features of free and open elections and civil liberties, as a tremendous achievement for mankind, to be defended against all efforts by totalitarians and reactionaries to undermine it. We regard the democratic republic as the foundation and the prerequisite of all serious efforts to achieve socialism. But we do not regard it as the final act in the drama of human liberation. Unlike capitalists and their supporters, we do not consider the establishment of political democracy to be the end of man's collective public activity, but instead the beginning.

We therefore subject the limitations and inadequacies of the democratic state to a rather severe and iconoclastic criticism. This criticism does not aim to demolish the authentic achievements of political democracy, but only the spurious claims which are made for those achievements — especially, the claim that democracy in the political sphere establishes a reign of unsurpassable freedom and opportunity in all other spheres of human activity. To the limited and partial achievements of political democracy, we wish to — not substitute, but add — the fuller realization of social democracy. Social democracy seeks in the economic realm what the democratic state brought about in the political realm. Just as the French Revolution expropriated the aristocracy's "private property," political power, the socialist movement works for the removal of commanding economic power, the real private property of the rich, from the hands of the few and its transfer to the control of the many.

We are therefore "collectivists" with respect to private economic power in capitalist society in the same sense that the French revolutionaries were "collectivists" in regard to the private political power of the feudal aristocracy. The French revolutionaries of the 18th century derived the moral sanction for their radical expropriation of the aristocracy from the observation that state power, since it claims authority over everyone in society, ought to be responsible to everyone in society. State power not so responsible they defined as tyranny. To put an end to the tyrannical state, they evolved the democratic republic, in which political power is made responsible to a citizenry composed of juridical equals through the mechanism of regular elections. Socialists proceed from the same observation carried out, we think, with a more powerful lens. We note that economic power in capitalist society affects everyone even more pervasively than political power in feudal society, from which we conclude that the vast economic power which capitalism concentrates in the hands of the few is tyrannical in the same way that concentrations of political power in the hands of the few is tyrannical. We seek to put an end to this tyranny by "socializing" private economic power just as the capitalist radicals of the 18th century socialized the private political power of kings and nobles by "democratizing" it.

Two obvious questions arise. First, what social force can supply the power necessary to introduce socialism? Second, what are the specific forms of social institutions under socialism? The answer to the second question flows from the answer to the first. The political power, which is to say the collective social interest, that energizes all serious advances toward socialism is the organized working class of capitalist societies.

The decisive role of the working class in the movement for socialism does not derive from any monopoly on moral virtue which it holds, nor from the fact that it is the most oppressed section of the population in modern society. Considered as individuals, workers are not greatly more or less "moral" than anyone else in capitalist society, and certain sectors of the sub-proletariat outside of the working class by virtue of their permanent unemployment are much more oppressed than workers. The crucial significance of the working class in the movement for socialism stems instead from the unique sociology of this class, and from the special and pivotal position which it occupies within the overall structure of the capitalist economy. The economic position of workers under capitalism gives them a direct interest in not competing with each other. Their sociology is such that they are capable of tearing through the veil which capitalist ideology interposes between them and the conscious realization of this interest.

Simple economics explains why workers have a material interest in not competing with each other. So long as the market alone is allowed to determine the price at which a worker must sell his labor, wages will tend to fall to the level which those workers most desperate for a job will accept. By playing unemployed workers off against employed workers, and low-paid workers against most highly-paid, any competent

W.C. Fields

"THE CARD PLAYER"

ORIGINAL SCULPTURE BY JAN MERRILL

Charming figure of the old burbler himself, playing his cards close to the vest. An ideal bookend or decorative accent. 10" tall. Hand cast in your choice of Antique Gold, Bronze or Terra Cotta (grey) finishes. $25.00 postpaid. Color illustrations on request. Indiana residents add 2%.

Godfrey Daniel Gallery

GODFREY DANIEL GALLERY
P.O. Box 20281, Dept. C
Indianapolis, Indiana 46220

Please send the number of W. C. Fields sculptures marked below for each finish. I enclose check or money order for $25.00 for each figure ordered.

Name_____
PLEASE PRINT
Address_____
City_____
State_____ Zip_____

_____Antique Gold
_____Bronze
_____Terra Cotta (grey)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employer can ensure that his wage bill sinks to a minimum level supported only by the supply of the particular type of labor he requires and by the elementary survival requirements of his workforce.

On the other hand, if workers band together for the purpose of monopolizing their own labor, they introduce a hitherto absent scarcity factor into the market price of their work. So long as they remain united, and deal with their employer as a collective rather than as isolated individual workers, they can drive the price of their labor far higher than market conditions would otherwise dictate, for the simple reason that the employer will usually find it more profitable to settle on a somewhat higher wage than to bear the expense of a prolonged strike. To the individual worker's demand, "Pay me more," the employer can always reply, "Find another job." He must think twice about telling his entire work force to find another job, particularly if enough solidarity prevails among the working class as a whole to discourage scabbing.

Uniting in pursuit of a common economic interest sounds like a simple enough proposition, particularly in a capitalist society (what, after all, is a corporation if not a union of owners?), but it nevertheless represents a gigantic step into the center of the historical process for those workers who undertake it. For there is no greater heresy against the mythos of capitalism than the idea that cooperation rather than competition can result in economic gains. According to the ideology which justifies the operations of the capitalist economy, success is supposed to accrue to those individuals who demonstrate superior ability in competition with their less well-endowed fellows. Workers are energetically propgandized to the effect that their only hope of improving their lot lies through individual upward mobility earned by outperforming their lazier colleagues. The one in a million who actually does rise "from factory hand to company president" is regularly trotted out in an effort to convince each worker that he too can expect spectacular success if he manifests all the proper virtues — thrift, efficiency, uncomplaining obedience and above all, hard work.

What an appalling spectacle of immorality is presented to those imbued with this ideology by the sight of workers banding together for the express purpose of eliminating competition from their ranks *and actually succeeding* in elevating their economic position! No wonder that early trade unions were regarded by respectable society as evil conspiracies and solemnly defined by law as "unfair combinations in restraint of trade." To this day, enormous presures are brought to bear on workers to get them to abandon all sense of identification and solidarity with their fellows and to undertake the competitive quest for individual economic salvation. What is at stake here is not simply the obvious profit advantage which employers reap when they convince workers that a Horatio Alger future awaits them if only they display the proper Puritan virtues; much more important is the ideological and political integrity of capitalism itself. For the loyalty of workers to the private enterprise system is largely conditioned upon their acceptance of an image of themselves as model capitalists, junior grade, or on an acceptance of this model as an object of emulation, or at the very least, on a sense of their own inferiority owing to inability to measure up to this model. (This last mentality is perhaps the most subtly effective; "I never amounted to anything because I'm shiftless and irresponsible, I guess" has been the terminal thought of many a worker who has in fact spent forty years of his life slaving under the most rigorous factory discipline and contributing to society far more than the pittance society has returned to him.)

A trade union is a partial synthesis of social obligation and individual interest. Although partial, it is the only true realization of this synthesis in capitalist society, because it is the only institution whose members know that if they begin to compete with each other, they will injure themselves. The essence of the trade union is the strike, and the essence of the successful strike is the cohesion and solidarity of the strikers. In no other area of society is upward mobility achieved through a consciousness of collective interest. The sociology of working class life is such as to promote and force this consciousness upon individual workers, even against ener-

Do You March to the Beat of a Different Drum?

If so, The Alternative might be just the magazine you have been looking for. If you are a student or faculty member you qualify for a one-year subscription to this award-winning journal for the reasonable price of $2.00. All others unfortunately must still pay four dollars — at least until our CIA grant slips through.

Just clip this handy order form and send it with the appropriate amount of money to: **The Alternative — Circulation Dept. c-o The Establishment, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana, 47401 Continental, U.S.A.**

Enclosed is $.....for .....year(s) subscription to The Alternative (nine issues per year).

Name_____

Address_____

City, & State_____

College or Univ._____

Please enter a
☐ New Subscription ☐ Renewal
as checked below.
Student and faculty members:
☐ 1 yr. $2 ☐ 2 yrs. $3.50 ☐ 3 yrs. $5.00
Regular subscribers:
☐ 1 yr. $4 ☐ 2 yrs. $7 ☐ 3 yrs. $10

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

getic efforts on their part to resist it; the sociology of poverty, of middle class life, and of the wealthy elite, are all such as to foster the illusion that success is a matter of individual talent and ability. The impoverished lumpen proletarian calls it "hustling"; the elite calls it "character"; but they mean the same thing: a sense of self-esteem directly dependent on imputing vices and failings to others and a quasi-religious devotion to the principle of self-promotion. The most irresistible propaganda in our society is the propaganda which suggests to the successful individual that he succeeded because he is superior. He may start his upward odyssey with the most acute awareness of his dependence on the attention and care of others, with a highly-refined sense of the importance of sheer accident, of being born into the right place at the right time, and with the strongest feelings of loyalty and obligation to those who helped him. He will nonetheless in the course of his travels find these traits increasingly burdensome, especially so when they have to compete in his mind for psychological space with the immensely gratifying and constantly growing idea that "I did it myself." Eventually he will come to believe that he did do it by himself — all by himself.

What worker, as he pockets the wage gains which his union has won him, can claim — even to himself — that "I did this myself?" He can quite properly assert "I did this," but he must add, and knows he must add, a qualification: "...with the other guys." His sociological situation will not permit him to come to any other conclusion. But this conclusion immediately throws him into conflict with society's value system, according to which one is supposed to succeed by setting himself apart from his fellows — that, is, through competition. Once a worker has joined a union, participated in a strike and improved his status thereby, he has made a fundamental decision about who he is in this world, a decision with vast ramifications. He has decided that he is and in all likelihood always will be a worker, that the Horatio Alger scenario will not serve to lift him out of that role, and that his only hope of improvement lies in the improvement of the position of workers. The institution which he develps to bring about that improvement — the trade union — will in turn give rise to a whole pattern of social relations and an ethos reflecting and reinforcing that pattern. The entire pattern of organized working class life, in turn, finds itself under constant attacks of varying sorts, all of which emanate from the antagonism between the interests of workers and those of their employers. The chief instrument of these attacks in contemporary times is the state; the conflict between the two main classes of capitalist society therefore assumes a *political* form and manifests itself as the struggle between two fundamentally different approaches or *programs* for the solution of social problems. The trade unions are thus driven into the political arena even though they arise out of the purely economic interests of their members. Measures like Taft-Hartley, or more recently, President Nixon's "New Economic Program," have ten times more propaganda effect on politically bashful trade unionists than do the imprecations of America's all-too-few socialists.

In America, special historical circumstances have led to an anomalous circumstance whereby measures associated in Europe with democratic socialist parties have here become identified with the Democratic party and more peculiarly, with "liberalism," even though the latter has no particular philosophic or historic continuity with socialism. Nevertheless, when one speaks of the "liberal" as opposed to the "conservative" or the Democratic as opposed to the Republican approach to social problems, one is referring to very much the same conflict as characterizes most European countries, under the label Social Democrat versus Christian Democrat, or Labor versus Conservative, or simply socialist versus capitalist.

The essential elements of this conflict are well known. The Left believes in measures aimed at reorganizing social and economic institutions as a means of solving social problems. Specifically, the Left stresses intervention by the democratic state in the private economy for the purpose of introducing rational planning so as to maximize growth, minimize income inequalities, abolish poverty, establish full employment and institute a high level of social security through an expansion of the welfare state. The Right, in general, resists these measures and upholds the sanctity of private enterprise as a realm which ought to be kept free of governmental intervention. It defends business with the arguments traditionally associated with the defense of capitalism, most especially the one which holds that governmental intervention in the economy necessarily entails a loss of individual freedom and opportunity.

In the conservative mentality, the program of the Left is "collectivist." This designation expresses its accurate apprehension that the Left's program adds up to an attack on private property in the means of production. In America especially this apprehension conveys a clearer "class consciousness" on their part than on that of the working class and middle class liberals, who do not at all imagine that their cause is anti-capitalist or that their proposals for national economic planning, national health insurance and full employment tend to undermine private enterprise.

The Right employs the term "collectivism" as more than just a warning to itself of the anti-capitalist implications of the Left's program. It also uses the term as an epithet, suggesting two highly negative connotations. The first is the association of the liberal-labor-socialist program in the Western countries with the totalitarian regimes of the Communist world. In this connotation, the measures advocated by the Left in Western capitalist societies are supposed to lead in some way toward the totalitarian collectivism that prevails in the U.S.S.R., China, *et. al.* The advantages gained by the Right in discrediting the Left's program by identifying it with these regimes and their practices are so obvious as not to require further comment. What does require extended analysis, beyond anything which can be undertaken in a short article on socialism and its workability, is the degree to which this identification is valid, and the reasons why it can be made. These questions must be left aside for separate treatment, bearing as they do on the topic of socialism as it relates to the conflict between totalitarianism and capitalism rather than to the topic at hand, which is of the nature and functioning of socialism *per se*.

To some extent, the second negative connotation of the "collectivist" epithet subsumes and reinforces the first. It is that socialism, quite apart from any "Trojan horse" role which it allegedly plays *vis-a-vis* the external menace of Communist totalitarianism, is itself a menace to individual freedom and liberty. In other words, even if the phenomenon of Communist totalitarianism were completely liquidated, and the entire world were filled with democratic regimes and characterized by capitalist economic relations, the socialist movement would still threaten individual freedom. What we have here is the traditional conservative identification of freedom with private enterprise, which is rooted historically in the simultaneous emergence of democratic self-government and the ascendance of the bourgeoisie, and philosophically in the dichotomization of the individual and the collective which is the soul of capitalist ideology.

Practically speaking, the historical argument almost refutes itself. The past one hundred years have witnessed a steady expansion of all those "collectivist" measures in the advanced Western nations that the Right regards as inimical to individual freedom. Most of these nations have gone far beyond the program outlined by Marx in the Communist Manifesto as steps toward a socialist society. According to Rightist claims, the introduction of these measures — the graduated income tax, social security, national health plans, national economic planning, mass public education, etc. — should have led to a gross diminution of freedom and liberty in modern society. Yet the fact is that the exact opposite has occurred. There is incomparably more freedom in the West today than there was 100 or 50 years ago. The right to express unorthodox or unpopular ideas, the right to associate freely with others, the right to vote, religious freedom, and so on, have not contracted but rather expanded almost in direct proportion to the extension of those "collectivist" inroads on capitalism which are supposed to be so dangerous to freedom. Evidently, the fact of capitalism's historical association with emerging political democracy is nothing more than that — a fact about their origins which needs to be supplemented by further investigation and analysis if we are to learn anything useful about their subsequent relationship. →

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rightists who are truly concerned with the survival of libertarian values in the modern world — as opposed to those who prefer being merely mouthpieces for the wealthy — would do well to ponder a contemporary relationship whose significance looms much larger than the historical relationship discussed above: that those countries where the working class is well organized and politically powerful (and where as a result socialist inroads on pure capitalism have proceeded farthest), are the countries with the greatest political and personal freedom, the most ideological diversity, the greatest pluralism and tolerance. On the other hand, those nations whose working class finds itself enslaved, such as the U.S.S.R., or severely oppressed, such as Taiwan or Spain, are consummately countries of tyranny. This latter correlation holds true, albeit in much different degree, whether the economy of the country involved is capitalist or statist. That the working class is the modern world's chief force for liberty as well as equality is not just an article of socialist theory but a demonstrable fact. By and large, where workers are free — free to organize, free to strike, free to press for political power — freedom prevails as a general condition for everyone (except perhaps for the rich whose idea of freedom starts and stops with the unhindered right to accumulate and dispose of wealth). But where the working class is weak, divided, disorganized, or oppressed, individual freedom is slight or non-existent.

The ideological implications of human individuality and its relation to the human collectivity is not the sort of subject that lends itself to condensed treatment. Nevertheless, this much can be said: the various social theories of capitalism, or what we have been calling conservatism, in general, regard individuality as an inherent human trait, as an *a priori* of social analysis and criticism, as the given datum, whereas socialist theory sees human individuality as the end product, as the thing to be striven for, as a potentiality rather than a reality, as the goal to be achieved. The most important ideological reason conservatives are against collectivizing the economy, from what I can gather, is that they regard social organization *per se* — that is, society, social institutions — as the fundamental source of all oppression of the individuality, and hence of repression of freedom and creativity on the part of human individuals. From this view it follows that society ought to be so organized as to allow for the maximum expression of individual freedom — "equality of opportunity" — consistent with the maintenance of law and order. If man is "born free" and his individuality is a natural biological or spiritual trait, then every social norm, obligation and limitation — indeed, every social relationship, every association with another individual no matter of what type — is an infringement and a restriction upon his inherent freedom, his "natural rights." Man versus society is the primeval theme of nearly every serious theoretical justification of capitalist society that I have encountered. Some theorists line up on one side of this dichotomy and some on the other (i.e., some conceive of human nature as inherently bad and of society's restrictions and limitations on it as the source of good, while others view human nature as spontaneously good and society as its corrupter); thus springs up the authority-anarchy debate continuum so characteristic of political discussion in capitalist society. But all, or nearly all, of these justifications proceed from this fundamental counterposing of the individual to society.

Socialist theory proceeds from fundamentally different premises. We view human individuality as gradually emerging in historical time through a process of social evolution, much as the human infant gradually acquires identity and selfhood through the socializing influence of its family group. We believe man realizes his individuality not against or in conflict with society, but in and through society, which is to say, through his social relations, his associations with other human beings. We do not counterpose the individual to society. Instead, we see society in conflict with itself and the individual in conflict with himself, and in each of these conflicts the reciprocal of the other. We look upon the man versus society dichotomy as an ideologically distorted representation of a real conflict constantly going on between groups of men within society. The conflict between man and society is a phantom conflict between two abstractions, having no more reality than the idea of man in the absence of the society which creates him or the idea of society in the absence of the men who compose it. This abstract and delusive way of posing the problem effectively ensures that it can never be solved, but only stoically accepted, which needless to say is rather how one would expect it to be formulated by those whose interests lie in not having it solved.

Socialists are for collectivizing private economic power as a means of realizing human individuality, not suppressing it. We analyze history and society in terms of class struggles not because we desire to "stir up conflict between the classes" but in order to abolish this conflict in the only way possible — by abolishing classes. The measures we advocate, whether they be piecemeal reforms or sweeping transformations, do not "level" mankind or impose a stifling sameness on human variety and distinctiveness. On the contrary, because they bring to fruition a profound human drive to assert conscious control over the very social processes and institutions which make man human rather than animal, they result in the flowering of human individuality on a scale undreamed of in earlier ages. They climax the historical drama of man's self-creation which if it is to culminate in fulfillment rather than in the bloody farce of totalitarianism, must culminate in man the socialized individual confirming both his individuality and his sociability by taking collective possession of and asserting purposive control over that which he invented to take possession of and assert purposive control over nature: his social system.

Those who lack faith in humanity's capacity for this task lack faith in humanity itself. Unlike the feudal aristocracy, however, which could obscure its contempt for mankind behind a cloak of faith in the supernatural, with which it justified its own god-like powers on earth, defenders of contemporary capitalism (which turned the supernatural into a cash proposition long before the counterculture) must assert their faithlessness in man as bald secular propositions. For confirmation they rely upon our century's bestial innovation, totalitarianism, which, they claim, offers all necessary evidence of man's inescapable perversity. The shred of truth in this civilized nihilism lies not in its notion of a link between totalitarianism and human nature, but rather in its implicit acknowledgement of the link between the rise of totalitarianism and the perpetuation of capitalism. For no anti-socialist propaganda of the conservatives has been of even marginal significance in demoralizing Western man and obstructing his advance to socialism as compared to the devastating influence of totalitarianism. Without totalitarianism, capitalism would long since have evolved into democratic socialism. When totalitarianism disappears from the world, capitalism will have lost its last justification. Despite all the real tensions and conflicts separating them, the two systems have that stake in each other's existence. □

Palmists and Scholarship

Dan Joy

THERE IS SOME reason to believe that after many years of dreariness the Academy may be coming to life. And it has nothing to do with the bombs of the Weathermen. If there is one encouraging thing from a growing number of intellectuals today it is the return to the question, What kind of society should America be? The last decades, especially in the colleges and universities, have been devoted to systems analysis and decision-making processes. This undue concern over methodology has left everyone quite bored, save for the many textbook writers who are committed to an unending review of the technique of our society's operation. Lost in this maze has been the traditional appreciation and quest for understanding of the society's foundations.

Contemporary critics, most of whom have resided on the political and philosophical Right, have questioned the directions taken by Western culture in general, and American society in particular. The anti-New Deal arguments of the 1930s, based on economic utili-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tarianism, have given way to more fundamental criticisms that the materialism, upon which the experiments and adventures of the New Deal and New Frontier were founded, was bankrupt and incomplete. Richard Weaver, writing in *Ideas Have Consequences*, suggested that the doctrines of economic growth and Progress, so dominant in our intellectual and political affairs, were the cause of much that had gone wrong. He challenged the dual doctrines as representing blind faith in Time and a superficial utopianism based on the power and destiny of economic development. What it all amounted to, he contended, was that Samuelson's economics required the worship of the Gross National Product, with the best of all possible worlds being the experience of seeing it grow and grow and grow. In such a scheme of things the Bureau of Labor Statistics becomes the barometer indicating society's health. Men of the Right have been making this point for years.

When the Richard Weavers and Russell Kirks entertained the critique, there was hardly a ripple — because it is known in intellectual circles that from the Right one is destined to get the "anti-intellectualism" of which Hofstadter duly warned. Plus they're all fascists anyway. But now the Weavers and Kirks have been joined by a strong voice from what has traditionally been the domain of liberalism, the serious and literate establishment intellectual. In the Summer, 1971 issue of *The Public Interest*, a journal identified with those who long have been on the Left, a most interesting essay written by E. J. Mishan appeared. "Interesting" is not really the word to describe the essay, the title of which is "On Making the Future Safe for Mankind." No, not "interesting;" "outrageous" would be more like it.

If you were to rely on the title you would think that Mishan is probably a devotee of Ralph Nader, that paranoid crusader who spends much of his time telling Congressional committees where it's at. But if Mishan sees himself with Mr. Nader, then a little restudying is in order. While the two might be temporary allies, they really have nothing in common.

Nader is a technocrat who sees himself in the role of bringing perfection to the existing industrial mechanism. To him, an imperfect car is to be recalled and the failure blamed on some greedy businessman who did it all intentionally while pursuing profit. This is not how Mishan sees it at all. To him, the actual problem is the industrial mechanism itself. This remarkable essayist contends that we are "living on the brink of annihilation." He concludes that the Doomsday prophets are right, probably understating the case, and further, "the forebodings of the past may after all soon be vindicated." Mishan's critique is close to total and his rhetoric as severe as it could be without drifting into screams and diatribes.

In a word, Mishan hates factories. Whatever the problem, industrialism did it — "It is my conviction that the continued pursuit of economic growth by the 'advanced' nations is itself almost wholly responsible for the crisis." He adds majestically "I am not one of those who believe that the Luddites were wholly wrong."

There is much in the Mishan essay which is wise and, in my opinion, quite correct. Unfortunately, as a theorist, he seems compelled to make outlandish conclusions from sound analysis. As he carefully works toward a sober point he abruptly changes direction and with apparent pleasure blows you off your chair with such statements as: "I once wrote that the invention of the automobile was one of the greatest disasters to have befallen mankind. I have had time since to reflect on this statement and to revise my judgment to the effect that the automobile is *the* greatest disaster to have befallen mankind.."

To support the contention he points out that the world's greatest cities are subject to "the choking din and the endless movement of motorized traffic." He notes that the automobile has caused cities thousands of miles apart to appear strikingly similar, and hence boring. I would think him correct in his support for the conclusion, but one must be more than a little skeptical of the conclusion itself. In his enthusiasm to condemn that which is a product of technology he gladly puts intellectual blinders on to prevent his seeing that the automobile, albeit in altered form, meant a revolution in delivery of such non-plentiful items as fresh fruit in the cities and seafood in the boondocks. Such things are not unimportant, even if not primary.

Mishan's problem is one of cause. The mass, electronic media has done its part in corrupting the language but in the process it has brought distant historical events into the living room. I am not convinced that one is so much better off spending his Saturday evening down at the poolhall, rather than with the tube and "Saturday Night at the Movies." Some critics make the mistake of suggesting that polar opposites are television or a book. First, one can appreciate both. Second, those who read — always a few in number — probably continue to do so, and not always *Time* or *Life*.

It would be a mistake to convey the impression that Mishan's critical effort is not worthwhile. I figure he is more correct than not. I simply demur from accepting his bombshells regarding the cause of man's woes. As a man of letters he laments the increasing sloppiness in language, and as an educator he argues that our loss of true education is disastrous. He is correct. It's just that every time he locates a problem he also finds a machine which ought to be smashed. I do not contend that the Detroit worker on the line really has an interesting worklife, but then again, whoever supposed that the poor chap who earned his way pulling a barge down the Erie Canal relished his labor either.

Without going so far as to contend that the source of all our problems is the intellectual attitudes which go to make up secular liberalism, it might be suggested to Mishan that he take into account those attitudes. The drift of our intellectual world under the dominance of secular liberalism has been more crucial to our contemporary unease than the machine, *per se*. To return to Richard Weaver, he wrote the Mishan article more than two decades ago — but did it from the view that it is man's inclination toward false notions and incorrect ideas which has led us to the monumental crisis in Western life, a crisis which Mishan perceives, even if with misplaced emphasis. □

CONTINUING CRISIS

(continued from page 2)

Longshoremen's strike indicated that the pay board was doing about as well as expected. And in Vietnam, President Thieu grumbled about a slight he had received from Secretary of State Rogers. Back in the States, Assistant President H.R. Haldeman, attracted similar reactions from Democrats for what they construed as an objurgative remark about them.

● The ecology crusade continues. Mr. William Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency was criticized in the Senate for "not doing enough" or for doing it with the wrong sort of people. Toyota recalled several thousand defective autos and it was in Dingle Dghem India that Mr. and Mrs. Bhutto Ferdri Bish were trampled to death by a herd of drunken elephants. Local elephants have been going berserk after eating overripe fermenting fruit. It was the third reported rampage in the last two weeks, and many more cases are suspected to go unreported. The Tulsa Zoo is reportedly interested in Mr. Lawrence Wise's albino snake. And twelve pigtailed macque monkeys were lost by the Penn Central railroad somewhere between New York and Washington, D.C. Edgar Snow died, as did the poet, Marianne Moore, and Joe Hernandez, known to millions as "the Voice of Santa Anita."

● The drive to keep America beautiful received a digitalis when comedienne Phyllis Diller got a $4,000 nose job, and Senator Proxmire had his face lifted. So intense has his enthusiasm for a more beautiful landscape become that the Wisconsin Solon has also announced that he is undergoing a painful hair transplant. Now sporting a toupe Georgia's Lt. Gov. Maddox is beautiful, and Szlvardo Silva E. Souza has designed a thirty-nine story vertical, high-rise cemetery for downtown Rio De Janeiro — the first of its kind. Sixteen thousand Frenchmen perished from road accidents in 1971. Air pollution threatens the ski necked turn of Long Island, and in the British Parliament Labor Party MP William Hamilton has warned that the Royal family seems "to breed like rabbits."

● Attorney General Mitchell resigned to direct Mr. Nixon's re-election bid.

(continued on page 23)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rebuttals to *The Alternative*

Rebuttal to North

In Defense of the Sawbone

Dr. John D. King, M.D.

THE ALTERNATIVE of January carries an article by Gary North entitled *Natural Foods vs. The Synthetic A Priori*, which is so replete with misstatements as to deserve a rebuttal. That such an article would be published by *The Alternative* puzzled me at first—and still does, in fact. My best theory is that defending the Individual (even though he has the earmarks of a charlatan) against Collective Power (e.g. the medical trust) strikes the editors as serving libertarian ends. No matter. Suffice it to say that the North article is as incongruously naive and obscurantist one to appear in a journal ordinarily devoted to sensible and honorable causes.

The article begins by crediting the mavericks and "invaders" for all the big breakthroughs in science. The intellectual-professional establishment, by contrast is accused of resisting progress at every turn. We learn that the major scientific advances of the past 350 years were "universally met with hysterical resistance from the organized intellectual guilds." This notion may have the makings of good theater, but it is bad history. Did hysterical resistance greet the laws of electromagnetism, or the cell doctrine in biology, or anesthetics, or the telephone, or the electric light, or the airplane, or radio, or moving pictures, or x-rays, or radioisotopes, or blood transfusions, or antibiotics, or any of a dozen other important things you can quickly add to the list?

Consider the galaxy of major scientists: Boyle, van Leeuwenhoek, Newton, Franklin, Cavendish, Priestley, Lavoisier, Volta, Faraday, Mendel, Maxwell, Mendeleev, Darwin, Roentgen, Michelson, Edison, Thomson, Einstein, Planck, Curie, Fleming, Bohr, Fermi, Burnet. Who among them was martyred by his fellow-intellectuals? Their ideas may have stirred controversy, but conspiracies against them in the scientific community are little better than imaginary. Galileo was severely suppressed by the Church, which, if an intellectual guild, has rarely been considered a scientific one.

But the chief villains of the piece are the AMA and its running dogs. Almost any stick will serve to beat the doctors. Even the ancient practice of bleeding is denounced, though its relevance to the present or to the conspiratorial version of medical history is a bit obscure. Jenner and Pasteur are hauled out of the past dressed up as victims of medical cabals. In fact, there was little or only transient organized resistance to the ideas of either man, and both were generally acclaimed by scientists and laymen alike within a few years of their discoveries.

The absurdity of the charge that the medical profession is "thoroughly organized for resistance to new ideas" should be made obvious by a moment's reflection on the differences in the level of medical science now and that of a mere 30 years ago. The easy and rapid dissemination of new ideas has long been an attribute of the medical community. The very volume of medical literature now poses its own crisis, and doctors are hard put to keep up with the flood of new information made available to them. Admittedly intolerance exists in that the scientific method is still hotly defended. But it is that, and not some mythical barrier to original ideas, that actually incommodes the cultists who are rejected by organized medicine.

Then we are served up the Passion of Dr. Ivy and the Drs. Durovic. "Convincing proof" is said to have been repeatedly offered on behalf of krebiozen, which is simply not true. A careful study of patient records supplied by the Krebiozen Foundation to the FDA and the National Cancer Institute showed that krebiozen had not the slightest effect on cancers. The krebiozen story at every turn has been featured by false information and concealment of data by its advocates. Permit just one sample, to give you the flavor of the thing.

The original announcement of krebiozen by its promoters, via a news conference at the Drake Hotel in Chicago in 1951, concerned 22 patients treated with the drug. Eight of these patients were tabulated as dead, but not from cancer. It was later established that 10 patients were dead at the time and that all had either definitely or probably died of cancer. One of the two concealed decedents was the wife of Dr. Pick, a close associate of Dr. Ivy in the krebiozen venture; the brochure commented on this dead woman's condition: "much improvement." When confronted with the matter later, Dr. Ivy stated essentially he had felt no obligation to mention Mrs. Pick's death from cancer because nobody in the audience had asked him about it! (J.F. Holland, *The Krebiozen Story: Is Cancer Quackery Dead?* Proceedings of the Third Nation-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

al Congress on Medical Quackery, Chicago. 1966.)

Quite a number of doctors did use krebiozen, the great majority of them on only one or two patients, which is significant in itself since these doctors were at liberty to have continued using the material on additional cancer patients for years had they so desired. Another interesting sidelight is the wealth amassed by Ivy and the Durovics during krebiozen's heyday. Dr. Stevan Durovic skipped the country, in fact, under indictment for income tax evasion to the tune of more than $900,000. A revealing look at the krebiozen promotion is provided by G.D. Stoddard in *"Krebiozen": The Great Cancer Mystery*, Beacon Press, 1955.

North's gullability, which is a very Mariana Trench, leads him to tout the even more bizarre teachings of Dr. Max Gerson, whose claim was to cure tuberculosis and cancer by dietary and other means. Preparation of the curative vegetable and fruit juices was so exacting and difficult that Gerson helped out by offering for sale to his customers a special juicer for $150. One of his other measures for treatment of cancer, for some reason omitted from North's medical expose, was copious enemas of coffee. Only the fresh-brewed article was considered effective, by the way, and instant coffee was found to lack cancer-controlling properties (W.S. Ross, *The Climate is Hope*, Prentice-Hall, 1965). In the Gerson case, the AMA's sinister power extended to the successful intimidation of the world's foremost book publishers, an awesome achievement without question.

I will not detail my low opinion of the currently fashionable food fads and will be content to remark that they are very poorly documented. In our curiously superstitious age, a surprising number of people are willing to believe they are being covertly malnourished and poisoned by the supermarket, but there is very little, if any, evidence to support such ideas. By the way, the reader is invited to compare any orthodox medical journal with any "health food" publication, to see which presents detailed and specific evidence and which doesn't.

Regarding the socio-political aspects of organized medicine, the foolishness of the article is again full measure and running over. The AMA has never had the right to license doctors in any state. As to the AMA's monopoly power, how is it that the public has such a wide choice among the healing arts and that upon feeling poorly, one may take himself to an osteopath, a chiropractor, a naturopath, a Christian Science reader, or the closest Zen den or health food store? How is it that in 40 out of the 50 states, M.D.'s are not even compelled to belong to the AMA? It does seem like a hell of a way to run a monopoly. The AMA is losing members now, perhaps chiefly because of its penchant for appeasing those who make political hay out of moaning about the health crisis in America.

Even the most elementary concepts of scientific thinking get squashed in North's anti-establishment tirade. "Scientists," he asserts, "need confidence in their theories, even in the face of recalcitrant facts," and that "faith in an intuition" is basic to scientific advances. These notions are an amalgam of nonsense and *non-sequitur*. Intuition is by definition devoid of conscious reasoning and has no valid application to science. Conjecture, hypothesis or speculation are what might have been intended. Furthermore, an investigator may pursue whatever lawful research his fancy may inspire and do unsuccessful experiments by the hundred, with no worse penalties than the wrath of his billpayers or the private derision of his friends. It is only if he openly declares his hypothesis to be a proven and established law in the face of "recalcitrant facts" that he earns the obloquy of his colleagues—especially so when human lives are at stake. He who makes unsupported claims just because he is richly supplied with faith has abandoned the scientific method and fully deserves the professional ostracism that will be his lot.

Doctors and other scientists do, of course, make mistakes. The charge of excessive caution can sometimes be made to stick. Yet, such errors of conservatism in medicine are born of a valuable precept: *primum non nocere*. Above all, do no harm. The public may be thankful that doctors recall this maxim as often as they do. The irony of most of today's public health flaps is that they are so often concerned with far-fetched dangers to health, such as the supersonic transport, DDT and soda pop cyclamate. But that's another subject. Far worse than any of this is the enticement of people to false and disastrous hopes in an hour of real danger.

The Alternative has permitted itself to be used in a shabby cause indeed. □

Rebuttal to Nelson

You Won't Have Civilization to Kick Around Anymore

R. Fredrick Docksai

There has been a lot of talk in recent years about the decadence of Europe. I would ask people not to be so simple-minded as to think of Spengler immediately after the decadence of Europe or the West is mentioned. Before his book, everyone was talking of this matter, and as is well known, the success of his book was due to the fact that the suspicion was already existing in people's minds, in ways and for reasons most heterogeneous.

— Jose Ortega y Gasset (1932)

PETROLEUM JELLY for chafed minds! This judgment by Ortega was reserved for Oswald Spengler and every other intellectual contemporary who, because of vanity and despair, chose Ultimate Theories and other exciting but inadequate formulas to explain the direction of history. Great men are not immune to great errors in judgment. Oswald Spengler, B.F. Skinner and Herbert Marcuse have many differences. But as for likenesses, they succeeded in misreading Hegel and using his historical method to do what Hegel would never do: draw an incontrovertible assumption (e.g., the West is on a *steady* road of decline) and use it to construct our incontrovertible conclusion. Hegel was not only (or should I say merely) a social critic but a brilliant historian. He was too familiar with the complex and too often inexplicable landscape of history to draw teleological laws which contained neatly packaged directional signals and a forseeable goal. In this way, as in a few others, Hegel was the conservative and not the radical Utopian. Yes, we can intuit a general direction of *present* history. We can approximate our 'paradigm of essences.' But to write as particularly as Spengler does and draw the conclusion that civilization is doomed; to point to such phenomena as the rise of democracy and the invention of hard whiskey as manifestations of our demise is intellectually sloppy. Using the state as an example for analysis, Hegel observes, "By listing attributes, etc., no progress can be made in assessing the nature of the state; it must be apprehended as an organism. One might as well try to understand the nature of God by listing his attributes."

The editor of America's most important magazine has asked me to comment of Brent Nelson's review of *Spengler's Selected Essays*. I am glad to oblige, because though I share Mr. Nelson's concern, I do not fashion his despair. First, there are some corrections to be made.

1) In his article, Frederick the Great (Friedrich der Grosse) is once again used unfairly. I say *used*, because King Frederick is to Germans what, proverbially, Thomas Jefferson is to Americans. They are both used to testify on behalf of every cause, exploited by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every carrier of Ideology. Saying, as Nelson does, that Frederick the Great articulated the 'ideal' of the candlestick-maker's socialism is revisionism at its seediest.

To quote in full what was quoted only in part in Brent Nelson's article, Frederick said, in his work on the theory of government, "The monarch is not the absolute master but only the first servant of the state." (As every would-be Germanophile ought to know, a Prussian king would never be so crass as to use the personal form, *Ich*; that is, to say, "*I* am the first servant of my state." Such fare is reserved for bar-

Great American Series

"The hellless hell of compulsory heaven-on-earth emphatically isn't my pail of blueberries."

— e.e. cummings

maids, peasants and Frenchmen.) Furthermore, the Prussian King was not defending socialism of any flavor. He wished simply to leave us with a personal, literary legacy which would defend and promote his preferred form of government, 'enlightened despotism.'

Though this may appear a meager criticism, it is important in the context of the Nelson article. In the article, we are left with the impression that although Spain is religiously fanatical and England is a silly little place for capitalistic Vikings, at least we have Prussia to salivate over. Prussia, where good ole King Frederick leads us in pursuit of the philosopher's socialism — or, as Brent Nelson prefers to describe it, "radical conservatism." Balderdash!

Not only was King Frederick not a prospect for the Spenglerite, but he was a product of the Enlightenment. He was a good militarist, an efficient administrator and he played a mean flute. His favorite hobbies were war and leisure. He disliked the very German literature Spengler had fantasies about, and he declared Goethe and Lessing to be vulgar. He helped institute equitable criminal procedures, but he also helped institute *formal* discrimination against Jews. What's more, he was probably one of the better German kings.

2) Ideology is not merely a phase nor is it dead! It merely changes clothes with each new generation of vain, imperfect people. (To wit: It is always the belief that *our* generation is the philosophical' and liberal' generation, while the preceding harvest had the ideologues. In truth, however, Ideological people merely get married and have Ideological children — usually.)

3) Nelson's description of his Socialism, "...to bring under legislative control the *formal* structure of the whole national productive force," has a flaw so basic that it is often forgotten by the tiller of high thoughts: Who is to run the *formal* structure? Usually, and at least inevitably, it is not the idealistic Brent Nelson. It is the Charles Foster Kane or the Salvadore Allende. Those who are crooks and "bastards" in a purely or partially competitive market economy do not experience moral transformations under socialism. Instead, if they can make it to the top, and they eventually do, they are provided with fewer but better roads of exploitation. The only difference, essentially speaking, between the Prussian's Socialism and Spengler's "Italian corporatism" is that instead of being operated by crooked Germans it is operated by crooked Italians. Talk what you will, Mr. Nelson, of "rights" guaranteed under beatific, futuristic Spenglerian Socialism. But as my wise, philosophical grandfather used to counsel Wagner freaks during his day, "*Er will was er will, aber die Welt ist nicht still.*"

4) Finally, and most importantly, the problem of Spengler! To say that the West is declining — politically, socially and morally — carts more fatalistic baggage and determinism than an honest analysis would allow. The problem is best stated as follows: "It is not self-evident that in shrinking quantitatively the West is morally deteriorating. Logically, the contrary might equally be the case. There are similar confusions with words like 'ebb,' 'break-up,' 'waning,' 'withering,' 'decay,' 'crumbling,' 'collapse' and so on. It may be of some significance that nearly all words referring to quantitative decrease have a negative feel when applied to human beings or society. But let us try to be Neutral. Let us say only: 'Western Civilization has been contracting;' and speak of 'the contraction of the West.' "

Once again, some may not appreciate the importance of the distinctions drawn between decline and contraction. But when James Burnham drew it, he did so recognizing a characteristic of our times which has been as well recorded as Ortega, Hegel or Polybius during their own episodes of the Continuing Crisis. That problem, our problem, cannot be answered as a mere political or economic one (e.g. Brent Nelson's call for a 'radical conservatism,' supposing that we may revise ourselves for the modern era of some 'Imperial Rule' by the Spenglerian democrats). The problem posed is whether or not the West has the *will* to survive and whether or not the West will once again subscribe to an affirmative creed which, alone, can be the only effective barrier to the West's total contraction and resulting transformation. (Note that I said transformation, not decline.)

The problem Marx poses us, as remnants of the West, has little to do with petty bickering over the meaning of class or the price of horseshoes. In the final analysis, it is his Total Negation, his grand Promethian NO which boldly defies everything the West was, is or can be in any mere liberal sense. Whittaker Chambers identified this after his conversion from communism, an identification which for his intellectual person was the ultimate tragedy: that Christianity was once the West's Affirmation, and with its withering the West was left with a void. Will this void be filled with Spengler's vision of an Imperial State? No. It just is not big enough. Hegel knew it. So did Ortega.

Brent Nelson appears to think little of conservatives who do not read the polls. Thus, he probably would have thought little of Chambers. For, as Chambers implored, the ultimate role of the conservative as the defender of civilization is to stand before the fat, ugly freight train of history and yell, Stop! Perhaps our efforts may prove in the end futile, though we are comforted by the historical truth that all successful efforts primarily appear such. However, to the Marxian command of Proceed!, any resistance less than an equal and opposite force will prove in the end futile for sure. Standing before the onslaught and yelling, Wait! or Perhaps!, as the neo-Spenglerian counsels us to do is sophisticated but ludicrous.

In the less analytical realm, this is not to say that as real people living in a real world we do not strive to buy time (i.e., maneuver between the interstices, to borrow from Chambers). We run for office or urge our betters to do so. We stand before the voters and talk about the weather rather than the selling of the T.V.A. (I am convinced that St. Thomas' definition of 'mental reservation' was a farsighted gift to Twentieth Century politicians who wished to avoid *direct* lies.) But we must never forget the primal foundation of our beliefs. When YAF's Sharon Statement was written in 1960, it was written in earnest, written in broad strokes in the hope that young conservatives of each succeeding generation would never forget. Brent Nelson, though impervious to YAF's growth as an organization over the years, thinks that we are not aiming to patronize the whole student community and is afraid that we are incapable of forgetting. I *know* that our aim is not to patronize the whole student community, and I *pray* that we are incapable of forgetting. Of course, life is ever causing problems for the living. True, freight trains can make tremendously painful dents. However, weeping over tomorrow's impending woe or reading Spengler or stripping our philosophical garments that we may better popularize ourselves with a student community which in itself is too often leaderless and opinionless, are poor substitutes for what the Sharon Statement embodies essentially: the Affirmation, the Irrevocable Stand without which civilization *must* decline. □

R. Fredrick Docksai is working for his M.A. in International Affairs at New York University Graduate School under Dr. Frank N. Trager.

Author's Query

I am preparing a manuscript for the new intellectual journal, *Ms.*, and am interested in any information relating to my thesis, "Breasts: The Female Inconvenience." Anecdotes and measurements will be appreciated.

Maxmillia Fanigboat
Department of Female Phonics
Smith College

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Public Interest

George Charles Roche III

ON PREVIOUS speaking trips to Hawaii, I have usually accepted an invitation to appear on a radio talk show of station KTRG in Honolulu. The KTRG people are consistent defenders of the free market philosophy and individual liberty. They are patriotic Americans who see much to defend in traditional American society.

A letter before me, written by one of the announcers of the station, tells the sad story which more people should hear firsthand. It appears that radio station KTRG has been accused of violating the so-called "Fairness Doctrine" by the Federal Communications Commission. Apparently the Federal Communications Commission did not feel that KTRG was representing "the public interest" in presenting its views.

Considering the fact that about 95 per cent of our communications media present a consistent leftist line, all without any apparent criticism from the Federal Communications Commission, it seems an odd charge indeed that KTRG could be accused of "one-sidedness." Yet this is the basis for the suspension of the radio station's license.

The first stage in the attack was the withholding of license renewal for almost a full year by the FCC, while "investigations" could be pursued. At the end of this year's suspension and delay, the FCC again postponed the hearing for an additional six months. The charges under "investigation" were absurd in the extreme. For example, KTRG had once signed off the air for four days while its transmitter was to be overhauled. This sign-off period took place with full FCC permission, yet one of the "charges" under investigation was that KTRG had signed off for those four days to frighten the public into writing letters of appeal to the FCC to keep the radio station on the air!

As the second hearing date approached, ed, fully one and one-half years after the entire attack on free speech had begun, the owner of the radio station had already spent $60,000 in attorney's fees. He was then told by one of the FCC commissars that the matter was far from over, since the Commission intended to use KTRG as a test case to see just what would have to be done to get a radio station off the air. The owner lacked the necessary resources to pursue what appeared to be an endless fight. Rather than pursue the matter further, he took the radio station off the air. Thus ended the FCC's crusade for freedom of expression and the "Fairness Doctrine."

The details of this particular case are long and involved. My own information comes from one of the announcers on the station, a young man now forced to seek other employment outside the broadcasting industry, as the direct result of his political views.

How many years until 1984?

Letter from a Whig

George F. Will

Ask Who? (Gesundheit)

(WASHINGTON) — There was much hilarity in August, 1968, when candidate Nixon stepped before the battery of microphones in Miami to announce his running mate with the improbable name. Wits everywhere asked, "What's a Spiro Agnew?"

This year in July in Miami there will be much hilarity when the Democratic presidential nominee, whoever he is, steps up to a battery of microphones and announces his running mate. Wits everywhere will ask, "What's a Reubin Askew?"

No, a Reubin Askew is not a sandwich. It is a young, handsome Democratic Governor of Florida. And the factors that made Agnew a sensible choice for Nixon are operating to make Askew a sensible choice for any Democratic nominee.

Nixon picked Agnew for two reasons.

First, Agnew was unknown. Anonymity is a virtue in Vice Presidential candidates. If a man has not done anything to make himself famous, he probably has not done anything to make any significant portion of the party or public mad at him. Enthusiasm can always be generated. Hostility cannot always be dissolved.

The second reason for picking Agnew was geographic. Agnew's Maryland is a border state. Because Presidential candidates rarely come from Southern or border states, Vice Presidential candidates frequently do.

The Vice Presidency, like Confederate money, is not worth a farthing. But Southerners take it seriously. Proof of this is the fact that a Vice Presidential candidate can actually change votes in the South. There is precious little evidence that any election but one has been decisively influenced by the Vice Presidential candidate. The exception was the 1960 election. Kennedy would not have won if Johnson had not campaigned so effectively in the South.

For decades the Democrats used the second spot on the ticket to preserve Party unity. It was the most the South could demand, and it was enough to keep the South in the Party.

From 1928 to 1964, the Democrats' VP candidates came from Texas three times, and one each from Arkansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Alabama and Tennessee. It was not until 1964, when a Southerner was at the head of the ticket, that the Democrats departed from their almost religious devotion to Vice Presidential candidates from Southern and border states.

By 1968 two Democratic Administrations had presided over a civil rights revolution, George Wallace was on the prowl, and the Republicans were competitive in the South. So the Democrats tried to win without the South. They ran two Northerners and lost a cliff-hanger to a Republican ticket that was geographically balanced to suit the South.

Surely the Democrats have learned their lesson. So Askew is the right man in the right place at the right time.

He is unknown. The scant national publicity he has received indicates that his personal style and bland liberalism is perfectly designed to seduce the journalists who will make him a household word after he is nominated.

And Askew is not just a Southerner; he is a Floridian. That is a special bonus.

Florida's fourteen electoral votes were important to Nixon in 1968. In 1972 Florida will cast seventeen electoral votes.

Nixon's 1968 performance in the nine states that now have seventeen or more electoral votes was not impressive. He won five (California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio) and lost four (Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas). He did not win a majority in any of these. He came closest in California with 47.8 per cent of the vote. Considering just the states he won, he fell furthest short of a majority in Florida, which he won with just 40.5 per cent of the vote.

Since 1968 the Florida Republican Party has blown itself to smithereens. Intra party rivalries led to a bitter primary fight in the 1970 Senate race. When the dust had settled the GOP had lost a golden opportunity for a Senate seat, and Askew was in the Governor's mansion.

Obviously there is no reason for the Democrats to concede Florida to Nixon, and it is possible that as Florida goes, so the nation will go.

To the extent that this diverse nation can be said to have an archetypal state,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Florida is it. Its economic and ethnic composition approximates the national average.

A politician who has demonstrated substantial appeal in Florida might even become that rarest animal — a Vice-Presidential candidate with solid national appeal. Thus it is significant that Askew piled up 56.9 per cent of the vote in winning the governorship in 1970, and he ran very well in both the rural northern panhandle and the urbane, cosmopolitan southern part of the state.

If the Democrats do nominate Askew, and win with him, it will be doubly ironic. Nixon's 1968 campaign will have reminded the Democrats that their old techniques still work. In addition, Askew (and other new moderate Southern Democrat Governors, e.g. Carter of Georgia and Bumpers of Arkansas) might never have been elected if Nixon's moderate racial policies had not diffused the race issue in the South. □

Mao, Mao-ing in Peking

Communist China, 1949-1968

by Frank N. Trager and William Henderson
New York University Press, $9.50

THE ANNOUNCEMENT that President Nixon would visit China this spring focused more attention on Communist China than did the detonation of her first H-bomb at Lop Nor in 1967; in fact, the American President's pilgrimage to Peking has been a political, and geopolitical bombshell. The U.S. had not been ignoring China, having kept diplomatic contact through the delegations in Warsaw, but Nixon's earlier feelers and his acceptance of an invitation to visit signalled a change in America's China policy, which change was soon followed by Peking's admission to the United Nations and the expulsion of Nationalist China. Most who lauded the President's decision and most who lambasted it would profit from *Communist China, 1949-1969*, which contains an excellent set of essays on Mao-land.

The fourteen articles concern three aspects of modern China: internal politics of the regime, life under the communist government and the impact of China beyond her borders. Especially important are pieces by Franz Michael (George Washington University) on the role of ideology, William W. Whitson (Asst. Secretary of Defense for Internation Security Affairs) on the role of the military, Yuan-Li Wu (University of San Francisco) on the economy, V.Y.C. Shih (University of Washington) on the treatment of Chinese intellectuals and Trager and Henderson on Sino-American relations. The articles are generally quite well-written and scholarly. Containing an excellent index, as well as an annotated and extensive bibliography and a detailed chronology, the book will be a useful reference. For a more thorough discussion of the implications of China's military potential, see the monograph done recently by Yuan-Li Wu for the American Enterprise Institute (Washington, D.C.), *Communist China and the World Balance of Power*. One must also look elsewhere for a detailed accounting of the cost in lives to the Chinese people of the imposition of the Communist regime; such a study has been written by Richard L. Walker (Director, Institute of Internation Studies, University of South Carolina) for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. (The estimate is 30 to 60 million Chinese lives, by the way, but it is very unfashionable to discuss such things.) Still, the articles selected by Trager and Henderson cover much ground well; no selection of topics would completely satisfy everyone.

Before Americans go overboard on the glorification of Communist China and start buying up Mao's Little Red Books, a few lessons from these essays should be heeded. First, Mao is a shrewd cookie, indeed, and he is serious about Marxist-Leninist-Maoism and quite willing to take two steps forward, one step back" to further the inevitable" victory over capitalism or to topple domestic rivals. Second, the communist regime is a thoroughgoing dictatorship. Third, although Japan has had and will continue to have significantly greater industrial power, the military power of China must be reckoned with. These observations deserve elaboration.

Certainly, Mao is a clever fellow — ask the former associates of Kao Kang, Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao. Each of these men were losers in power struggles with the Chairman. Mao used involvement in the Korean war as an excuse to unify the People's Liberation Army, and used the army to gain and keep control of the countryside. ("Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," Mao observed.) When Liu and other "bureaucrats" tried to undermine Mao's power and influence because they opposed the impracticality of the Chairman's ideological programs (backyard furnaces, "better Red than expert," and the like), Liu went from Number Two Man to Unperson, and Mao and Lin Piao unleashed discontented students and others in a Great Cultural Revolution to drive from office those lukewarm about protracted revolution in China. Lin Piao became Mao's anointed heir to power as the army was used to rein in the cultural revolutionists once the "bureaucrats" were humiliated. Maybe being number two man causes one to try harder: Lin is now also gone from the scene. . ."finished" as the New China News Agency ambiguously phrased it in October. Although military men comprise a large percentage of the high-ranking officialdom, Lin Piao's replacement by Chou En-lai may indicate that Mao has reinstated party control over the military, as Communist dictators (such as Stalin) have found essential to their continued rule. Uneasy lies the head that wears hat No. 2. One wonders how soundly Chou sleeps.

The Peking regime is a dictatorship, as attested to by many who have escaped, for instance the great violinist Ma, whose story *Life* carried only a few years ago. The government damns itself with the explanations it offers, after the fact, to explain why it had to do such and such to "defend Communism." During the brief period of relative freedom of speech, the Hundred Flowers campaign of May 1956 to June 1957, Mao himself admitted that nearly one million people had been killed in the first five years of the regime during "land reform" and other such beneficent campaigns. (Too much "blooming and contending" brought an end to the Hundred Flowers campaign and to the careers of those who had been too outspoken.) Two excellent essays in this book describe the barbarous treatment of China's intellectuals, most of whom had welcomed communism. Perhaps some of those now so eager for *rapprochement* with the Maoists will reconsider their enthusiasm once they familiarize themselves with what it is they would embrace. One thinks of the about-face done by leftist intellectuals concerning Cuban communism, after the brutalization of the poet Padillo was revealed. . .the more they know about such a regime the less attractive it is. (Will Albania be the next model" communist government, or are people catching on?)

What can Nixon gain from going to China? Besides befuddling those who would pigeon-hole him as conservative or liberal, he gains some leverage in balance-of-power geopolitics. Just the thought of a Sino-American alliance scares the Russians, who correctly fear the military potential of Chinese mass armies armed with modern equipment and backed by thermonuclear strategic weapons which would prevent the use of Russian tactical nukes. The Russians have countered this move somewhat already by strengthening their alliance with India, supporting her dismemberment of Pakistan in December. To the degree that Russia's eastern flank is more exposed she may be less likely to risk war in Europe or around the Mediterranean, a gain for the U.S. and its Israeli ally. The visit may also undermine the confidence of the North Vietnamese, who could fear a sell-out by her Chinese suppliers, and make them more willing to compromise with the U.S. In the long run, the response of the Japanese to all this could be crucial. The Japanese seem destined to be the world's largest industrial power by 2000 A.D. (see *The Emerging Japanese Super-State* by Herman Kahn) and are already the third largest. Although the Japanese government of Premier Sato was shocked at not being consulted about Nixon's trip, their policies will probably be determined by the desire to keep their best customer, the U.S.,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happy while avoiding war. Finally, whether our other allies lose confidence in our keeping to our half of mutual-security agreements could depend upon whether we let China have only Taiwan's U.N. seat or let China have Taiwan; certainly Taiwan will be mentioned during the President's sojourn.

President Nixon will have to be wary while in the Flower Kingdom, bringing Kissinger and more to the man born the day after Christmas. Mao's government signed a joint declaration of the five principles of peaceful coexistence" with India in 1954, and then violated a few of them eight years later to carve out a bit more turf from India's borders. One understands the desire to use the threat of a Sino-American alliance to offset somewhat Russia's increasing strength, yet such an alliance has its problems, one of which is that much of the Sino-Soviet hostility originally arose from the reluctance of the Russians to commit themselves to armed intervention against the American "paper tiger" on behalf of foreign communist governments such as China.

Trager and Henderson have produced an informative book. Although the material probably wouldn't surprise the President, it could be an eye-opener for those with great expectations for his journey to Peking.

Douglas W. Cooper

History's Entrails

The Basic Symbols of the American Political Tradition

by Willmoore Kendall and George W. Carey
Louisiana State University Press, $6.00

THIS IS AN important book by the late Willmoore Kendall and his former student, George W. Carey, currently professor of government at Georgetown University. The authors set forth their thesis concerning the American political tradition in this fashion: "We have come to have two traditions: one which holds to a rather extreme view of equality; the other, an older one, which holds that our supreme symbol is to rule (by) the deliberate sense of the community. This accounts for the fact that we are somewhat schizophrenic today about our tradition. Beyond this is a graver matter; the two traditions are not compatible with one another, and the manifestations of this are quite apparent in our contemporary world."

In effect, twentieth-century American liberalism is the contemporary expression of that tradition which doggedly pursues equality. It commenced by wrenching the equality symbol from the Declaration of Independence and perverting that symbol into an instrument for constructing the egalitarian New Jerusalem. This tradition is secular in its philosophical foundations. It has no conception of "sin," "evil" and "tragedy," nor does it concede the imperfectibility of the human condition; rather, it argues that human nature is wholly malleable, and that the perfected good life is attainable through institutional and environmental manipulation. Driven on with this mind's eye view of the perfected egalitarian utopia, the liberal tradition becomes restive, anxious and on occasion fanatical when society seems impervious and indifferent to its hortatory, and when its Tower of Babel begins to reveal cracks and imperfections.

When confronted with the failure to attain instanter the worldly City of Man, instead of reappraising the soundness of their secularism and their view of the nature of man, the exponents of the liberal tradition double their efforts and attribute their continued failures to the ignorance of the populace ("more education is needed"), to the sinister machinations of reactionaries and recalcitrants ("greater political organization and effort is needed"), and to the general failure of society to appreciate the clarity of insight and vision of egalitarian utopianism. As always, "knowledge puffeth up."

In contrast, the conservative tradition in the American experience, which is the older of the two traditions, draws its nourishment from strikingly different roots. As opposed to the secularism of the liberal tradition, it is undeniably religious in temper. Unlike the liberal secularist, it is impressed (indeed, awed) with the wonder of creation and the mystery of being. To paraphrase, the conservative understands St. Augustine's insight, "I am, therefore God is." (The secularist has to be satisfied with Descartes's, "I think, therefore I am.") Along with such modern Augustinians as Reinhold Niebuhr, the conservative appreciates the relevance of such concepts as "original sin," "evil" and "the tragic sense of life." With Augustine, he understands that "pride" is the irradicable canker contributing to the imperfectibility of the human condition in this earthly sojourn. The conservative loves and reveres man as the creature and child of God, but he has no illusions about the erection of a worldly utopia, for basic human nature precludes it — Man is not God.

Moreover, by inoculating against utopianism, this religious temper produces a continuing political mood of moderation, restraint, conciliation, civility, and thereby contributes immeasurably to the deliberative process, and the pursuit of consensus, which are, according to Kendall and Carey, the foundation materials of the American political tradition. Where, in its zeal to create *now* the Worldly Paradise, the secular egalitarian tradition sometimes sees its querulousness and impatience erupt into an unseemly fanaticism, the conservative tradition, by rejecting the reconstruction of society from wholly new cloth, holds steady on course with confidence in the viability of organic growth through "the deliberate sense of the community," which community is composed of a "virtuous people." Contrary to popular myth, as a result of these distinctions, the conservative is congenial (including a generous dash of humor), warm, humane and human, while the secular egalitarian is more often aloof, cold, harsh and abstract.

Kendall and Carey contend that the two traditions are incompatible. Furthermore, they contend that the balance has been tipped in favor of the egalitarian one and that the older, conservative tradition has been "derailed." As they see it, the "derailment" commenced with the erroneous insistence that the egalitarian premise is the basic one in the Declaration of Independence. Among other things, this distortion has produced a series of "strong" Presidents who envision themselves as Great Leaders and the messiahs of leveling. Kendall and Carey offer no easy solution to correct the derailment (probably because there is none), but they do perform an invaluable service in documenting its occurrence, and they painfully remind us of the older and greater tradition from which we have been diverted.

Unfortunately, this book will not receive the currency in academic political science that it deserves. Two fundamental reasons account for this neglect. First, both writers are known as prominent conservative scholars, and academic political science is overwhelmingly liberal-left in its political orientation. As Seymour Lipset's recent study for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reveals, only nine per cent of the American college and university political science professors will accept the label "conservative" to describe their political leanings — even with the addition of the modifier "moderately" conservative. The liberal academy was never known for its generous and tolerant treatment of Willmoore Kendall, and its potential for ignoring this final important work is considerable.

A second reason for probable neglect by contemporary political science is that this book is in the great tradition of normative, traditional political theory. This approach is contrary to the behavioral hegemony currently astride academic political science. The behavioralists contend they are concerned only with the "is" of politics, only with "science," "facts," "quantification" "method" and "value-free" work. In contrast, in keeping with the great tradition of the study of politics, Kendall and Carey are concerned with the "ought-to-be," that is, with values, ethics, morality, the qualitative and in general with the problems of articulating and achieving the political "good" life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As this book is highly innovative methodologically, it is particularly lamentable that the behavioralists, in their preoccupation with "method," should ignore it. Kendall and Carey have fused the approaches of two distinguished political theorists. They have combined the "text analysis" method of Leo Strauss with the "symbols" approach of Eric Voegelin. Strauss has taught that careful text analysis of significant political works will reap rewards in terms of theoretical understanding, while Voegelin has emphasized that the study of political "symbols" can reveal much about a society's underlying theoretical foundations. In employing both methods, Kendall and Carey analyzed the following key documents of the American political tradition: the Mayflower Compact, the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the Massachusetts Body of Liberties, the Virginia Declaration of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, The Federalist, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. From this examination, they are able to detect the "derailment" of that sound, viable and durable tradition, rooted in the order of being, which Publius knew so well.

This book is political theory at its best, for the authors, with a keen appreciation of concretes and realities, have through the process of distillation discerned a broad theoretical overview of the essence of the American political tradition.

John P. East

The Play's the Thing, Maybe

The American Theatre, 1969-1970

Scribners, $9.95 cloth, $4.95 paper

BOURGEOIS culture we're told, has been touted; the anti-bourgeois, masquerading as the *avant-garde*, is on the verge of triumph. A tradition of the new, Harold Rosenberg's neat oxymoron, encourages art to be unfettered, breaking down all genres. We live in a time witnessing a break-up not only of genres but of rational cosmology as well. "The new sensibilities," writes Daniel Bell ("The Cultural Contradiction of Capitalism," in Irving Kristol and Daniel Bell, eds., *Capitalism Today* 1971) ... and, the new styles of behavior associated with them, are created by small coteries which are devoted to exploring the new; and because the new has value in and of itself, and meets with so little resistance, the new sensibility and its behavior styles diffuse rapidly, transforming the thinking and actions of larger masses of people."

Granted, the theatre does not reach large masses of people, surely not like the movies, that cultural form (aside from books) with which I'm most concerned. But more than film, more so, in fact, than any other art form, the modern theatre reflects the new sensibility, and, created by just such small coteries as Dr. Bell mentions, explores the new and meets with surprisingly little resistance by theatre devotees. Where once people were shocked even to rage, as happened at early performances of Ibsen (*A Doll's House*, *Enemy of the People*, and others), now in the West at least, those who frequent the theatre are tolerant of anything. It is those who do *not* go to the theatre — the anti-culture police, blue-nose judges, among others — who today threaten the theatre in America, and their threat is a rear-guard action and but delays, rather than impedes, the advance of just about any manifestation of theatrical whim imaginable (I think of the reception *Hair* received in Boston: closed by judicial order, with police connivance, because of some nudity and flag- disrespect" business, but eventually reopened with complete victory for the producers and defeat of the censors).

On any given night in America, more people see a prime-time TV show than attend all the theatrical performances performed across the land in an entire year. Statistics are unreliable here, but I'd guess that we could say in *two* entire years and not be far off the mark. Theatrical performances are expensive, usually at least twice as expensive as movies; one usually must plan in advance to go, march off to buy tickets, and then appear precisely on time. It's a bother that few Americans are willing to undergo, although hundreds of thousands endure much more inconvenience to attend Woodstock or Altamont; even the young, who think thrice and usually negatively about shelling out for a theatre ticket, will pay through the nose, and plan far in advance, to see the Rolling Stones, or Tina Turner, or name it.

Just what separates the sensibilities of the traditional theatre-goer from those of people who now appreciate the new theatre and, in addition, from those who lap after rock but shun the theatre, is hard to determine. Perhaps as a monstrous generalization one could say that the traditionalist demands linearity, the play's the thing," beginning, middle, climax, denouement; the new theatre-goer demands at least some thought and a *soupçon* of content but will contentedly tolerate an absence of linearity, whereas the young who shun theatre but patronize rock concerts demand sensation galore and happily settle for little if any content. Well, like all gross generalizations, this one may best uttered softly and then abandoned quickly.

These remarks are occasioned by the appearance recently of *The American Theatre 1969-1970*, a well-designed anthology containing some excellent, frank essays and a wealth of fine photographs and cartoons (Hirschfeld and others). The book doesn't answer all my questions about why today's theatre is as it is, or why I rarely see plays. Nor does it ease all my doubts about modern drama, although I found it more palatable than would have been the case two years ago, when on emerging from *Dionysus in 69*, I mumbled something about the play being subversive of the American value system" and was, I suppose justifiably, hooted at by my companions, both New Yorkers far more sophisticated and understanding of what had of late been happening on stage than I, a hick down from Boston for a weekend in the big city.

I can't evaluate *The American Theatre* or talk about trends in theatre with the same ease as I could about a book concerning today's film—that by way of advance warning. But I've the feeling that most who read this will be, like me, irregular theatre-goers at best, and many will have given up on the delights on the stage after their high school English teacher dragged them to their last local junior college production of *Lear*. Maybe they don't do that anymore in this country, but if they do, then I'm probably not wrong in thinking that for most Americans, theatre is still something one is taken to, at a tender age, and then abandoned like spinach.

Theatre is so changed, even in the heartland where I grew up, that our recollections of it from years ago scarcely square with today's reality. We did *Time Out for Ginger* when I was a budding and quite untalented thespian in school in the late fifties; we trooped eagerly off to see the Yale Players doing *Moliere* in the early sixties; we thought it was the end-all when, on escaping from grad-school for a weekend in New York, my roommate and I went to Genet's *The Blacks*; now they do *Fortune and Men's Eyes* at one of the colleges at which I teach, and that's the most conventional offering of the season. So I suppose *American Theatre 1969-1970* has a lot to offer me, and maybe you.

Is it the themes or the forms that most unsettle us? Is the reason that those of us who feel uneasy about and confused by today's theatre that we are not amused by cannibalism on state? Or is it the nudity? Surely not the nudity—the players are almost invariably nice to look at. Or the frequent seeming meaninglessness of the play:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bootblack Stand

Dr. George Washington Plunkitt, our prize-winning political analyst, has just completed a penetrating study of the last Congolese election. Published in August, it focuses on the unique position of minority groups in the Congolese electoral process; it can be purchased in all bookstores. It is titled *Escape! A New Demand Response System*. Now, through this column, the distinguished Dr. Plunkitt has agreed to advise American statesmen in this time of troubles. Address all correspondence to The Bootblack Stand, The Establishment, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, Continental U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

On February 8 Senator Proxmire was seen in Washington, D.C. wearing a pair of dark sun glasses, apparently to hide from the view of the people a couple of black eyes around his eyes. When several courageous and, I might add, dedicated representatives of the media asked him about these mysterious black eyes he had the temerity and, I might add, guile to say "no comment!"

Is this not a violation of the people's right to know?

Philip L. Geyelin
Editor, *The Washington Post*

Dear Mr. Geyelin:

This whole matter of the people's right to know is an enormously complicated issue. As with so many other things it boils down to a question of ethics. The essential question is "Can I or can I not make a buck from it?"

Now, of course, the newspapers can make a great deal of money by snooping around and turning up juicy tales about public figures. Poking around in other people's affairs has been one of the great triumphs of journalism and making the commonplace or the trivial juicy is what distinguishes the mediocre journalist from the virtuoso. Thus, this doctrine about the people's right to know is butter for every journalist's bread and should *ipso facto* be considered ethical and indeed sacred.

On the other hand, for the politician the doctrine can prove annoying and when taken to its extreme it can even debilitate a nation's polity. When journalists report their findings that, say, a Senator eats his beans from a can or sleeps in his suit, it is an annoyance for the esteemed representative of the people. But when a journalist is inveterately exposing, say, pay-offs between senators and HEW bureaucrats, this is a more serious matter. It is this kind of publicity that has given graft a bad name, and driven competent men from public life. Under such conditions public service loses all of its allure, and promising politicians depart for more profitable fields like journalism, for instance. What kind of government will you have if the Halls of Congress are inhabited by mediocrities? This is something the good government crowd never seems to understand.

There are some questions that are best left unasked. Now that reporters have been buzzing around poor Senator Proxmire, the word is out that those black eyes are the aftermath of a face lifting. What is more he is undertaking a dangerous hair transplant. In itself this might seem a matter of little moment but its significance is really quite grave, for now the Bolsheviks know that our senators, heretofore judged as the most comely solons on the globe, are artificially preserved. Think of the propaganda coup!

—GWP

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

For years now I have been increasingly aware of the enlightened qualities of the Chinese People's Republic. You can perhaps imagine my surprise when I observed that the Chinese delegation greeting Mr. Nixon's landing in Peking was decidedly unyoung, unblack and ungay. In fact from what I have been able to discern from the television coverage of Mr. Nixon's trip, there are no blacks among the government and party leadership. Long hair is suppressed. A kind of attenuated bell bottom seems to be allowed, but there is no grass. In fact, they all look alike to me. The people in the streets all look just like participants at 4-H Club Conventions. And who took the engines off all their cycles? Hell man, downtown Peking looked just like I imagine downtown Kansas City must appear. What is Red China anyway, a Rockefeller fiefdom?

Regards,
Pete Hamill
Dept. of Philosophy
The New York Post

Dear Mr. Hamill:

How astonished I am to see that even a serious journalist like yourself has fallen for Mr. Nixon's latest scheme. Those drab scenes you are seeing on television *are* **downtown** Kansas City. You have been had. This whole China thing is an elaborate hoax by Mr. Nixon to attract attention to himself and away from the horrors of modern Amerika. He simply packed all those eastern journalists onto *The Spirit of '76* and flew them to Kansas City. They have given him wave after wave of headlines. They have made him out to be a great yearner for peace. And all the while he has been mending political fences with America's agricultural barons.

Surely *you* should have known that the real China is one of the glories of the globe. Everyone disports about doing his own delightful thing. Life is elegant and exhilarating. Tolerance and diversity abound and there are flowers, always flowers.

—GWP

I hope the latter accounts at least for *my* disenchantment with the present theatre, but frankly I'm not sure. We must be honest about our motivations. I greatly enjoyed the very nude, very naughty *Dirtiest Show in Town*, not, certainly, because of its "story," which was minimal, in fact barely existent. The tendency to implicate others in one's less noble activities is always a danger, but am I simply rationalizing by thinking that it's precisely the kicks of voyeurism, legally sanctioned, as it were, that account for the success of things like *Dirtiest Show?*

The American Theatre 1969-1970 is the third in a series of annual publications, a good book by which to learn what's up in the theatre at present. Clearly Broadway is down; "off-Broadway," which includes off-off B and off-off-off B, is up — down and up, that is, in the eyes of this book's contributors. Walter Kerr of the *New York Times* leads off with a snappy overview of trends, his writing, as usual, more than competent. When discussing the afore-mentioned *Dionysus in 69*, for instance, Mr. Kerr talks of the "Theatre of 'therapy'," which he says is "with us everywhere, in the dithyrambic abandon of a suddenly topless *(sic!* Mr. Kerr must be myopic) bacchante inviting members of the audience to shed inhibitions and join the players on stage." So *that's* what it was.

We all know of theatre-in-the-round and in-the-square, but theatre in and around the audience is less familiar to most Americans. Richard Schechner of the Performing Garage tells us about this is his essay, "Post Proscenium." I admit again to a somewhat fusty attitude at the start toward theatre in which the players literally lunge at me; experiencing jostling genitals in my face, at a play, is a bit disquieting. But in the very few productions I've subsequently seen in which the players (not their genitals, however) bobbed around midst the audience, I found myself more interested, more involved, less put-off. Schechner's piece is leaden, but the trends he describes are intriguing.

In "Again from the Razed Ground, an Experience of the Theatre, 1920-70," Harold Clurman, one of the long-time giants of the American theatre (actor, then dramatist, now critic), offers a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neat review illustrated with wonderful drawings, text and illustrations alike evocative of better days on Broadway, days unlikely to find their match in the future, at least on these shores. When Martin Gottfried turns to "Broadway 1969-70," however, we really see the morass into which Big Theatre has fallen. The inventiveness, Gottfried clearly shows by omission, is no longer on Broadway, though the technical expertness still is. I recently saw *Follies*, as superlatively staged and as technically proficient a performance as one could want: big, bold Broadway. But the *plays* — and of this I'm in accord with Mr. Gottfried — the plays have been less than brilliant.

Gottfried had to strain to get through to the end of his piece without a yawn. Not so Clive Barnes, whose "Off-Broadway and Off-Off 1969-70" sparkles. The writing, as those who follow Mr. Barnes in the *Times* know, is scintillating, and he's so urbane, so quick to tire of faddism, that he deftly leads us through the mass of whoopsy-doo i-n-n-o-v-a-t-i-o-n to some perspective about what might have lasting value and what's there just to arouse. Once more (I hate to dwell, but I see I'm dwelling), for what is nudity for nudity's sake, if not merely to arouse? Barnes differentiates the "outrageious and uproarious" *Dirtiest Show in Town*, which was fresh and amusing, from such "drivel" as *The Way It Is* and *A Circle in the Water*, respectively hetero- and homo-nudies, both aborted even before their openings. Barnes seem almost to smack his lips with glee as he writes of all the wild and whacky (and, in some cases, nauseating) stage business enliven the off- and off-off offerings. The plain fact is that most of what's exciting in New York theatre isn't Broadway. Barnes shows why.

The book continues with some good pieces about theatre elsewhere, such as Arthur Ballet's "The Theatre of Middle America," which especially attracted me because of its intelligent discussion of the Guthrie Theatre in my boyhood home-town, Minneapolis, probably consistently the best company not on the coasts. Theatre waxes and wanes in Middlemerica. In Houston, in much of Texas for that matter, where I spent two years in the middle sixties theatre, most particularly the Alley Theatre, was rousing, innovative, daring, and Texans supported it. Now it's dead; oh, the Alley has a multi-trillion dollar home in which to frolic, but the theatre is dead. Oklahoma City is big this year. Next year? None of the book's articles gets into any sort of satisfying analysis of *why*. But obviously that's beyond the purview of such a collection of essays prosaically grounded in discussions of what is, rather than in convincing hypotheses of why it is as it is, and isn't.

Other essays include an interview with Peter Brook; a nicely-done light expose of "The Great Mail Fraud" and the hucksterism of regional theatre; *Los Angeles Times* man Dan Sullivan's discussion of California theatre; Herbert Kupferberg's fine piece on the New York Shakespeare Festival, this being the remarkable free theatre in Central Park which may account for whatever chance the "masses" have to come to love the bard as he deserves; and a fascinating piece by David Hays on the Theatre of the Deaf, one so exiciting that I've marked the deaf theatre down as an experience not to be missed the first time it comes to Boston or I come to it. The book concludes with a perfectly dreadful — adverb and adjective carefully chosen — mishmash "play" called *Vietnam Campesino*, which for ten dreary pages reveals why so much of the theatre of the political is unseeable, at least by me; and with a discussion of books and a good bibliography.

Just before the last few essays there appears one which is alone worth the price: "Theatres of Institutions?" by Zelda Fichandler, the driving force behind the Arena Stage in Washington, D.C. Her enthusiasm for the state, for the possibilities of theatre even in today's United States, are inspiring and solidly grounded in experiences, heartbreaks and successes alike, lending authoritativeness to all that she writes.

Zelda Fichandler doesn't know for sure what direction the American theatre is taking. Theatre in the streets has possibilities, though I'd guess that the loss of that magic quality present in an enclosed building is not sufficiently offset by the immediacy and mobility of outdoor theatre in public plazas; in addition, there doesn't appear to be much to separate such street theatre from the histrionics of the political street-corner harangues to which we've grown accustomed these days.

Broadway is in bad straits; regional theatre is a sometime thing; off-Broadway is a jumble of true creativity and squalid opportunism. But even for infrequent theatre-goers like me, the theatre remains uniquely that art-culture form which can transport one for a limited time into a world removed. *The American Theatre*, by no means perfect, nonetheless is a healthy sign of the continued high level of concern about and activity in our theatre. The new sensibilities, in Daniel Bell's terms, are definitely to be found in all degrees of quality, on stage.

David Brudnoy

Blood 'n Guts 'n Beethoven

A Clockwork Orange

A CLOCKWORK ORANGE has arrived on The Scene with the force of D-Day. *Time* and *Newsweek* have headlined it; critics have made profound judgments about it as a Parable Of Our Times; the with-it crowd has already seen it three times. The discerning moviegoer will have already recognized these phenomena as signs of a Very Bad Movie, but for once he is in for a surprise: *A Clockwork Orange*, despite some major faults, has moments of true excellence that stand like a lighthouse amidst the pornographic and commercial mainstream.

Briefly, we have a fantasy-fable of the future, set in an Orwellian nightmarish world ruled after dark by teenage gangs. Our anti-hero is Alex, leader of his own gang and a working-class tough whose primary interests in life seem to be mugging, looting, raping and listening to Beethoven. Alex is nothing short of a fascist beast; a causeless rebel whose level of thought oscillates between the gutter and the groin — yet there is one aspect of his humanity that is not perverted, and that is his love of classical music. His passion for Beethoven is, I suppose, what makes him strangely forgiveable as he patrols the streets with his gang, committing indescribable acts of violence and mayhem.

Alex and his "droogs" (friends) live somewhere in a dreary socialist England that is in the process of becoming a police state. From the "Nadsat" language of the young we are given to believe that the Russians have conquered and are in the process of instilling the Worker's Paradise, but this aspect is underplayed by the producer, Stanley Kubrick. At any rate, Alex is finally caught by the police and convicted of murder, and after a useless year or so in prison is subjected to a "new" form of penology, a sort of cinematic Pavlovian brainwashing that conditions him against violence and sex, and inadvertently Beethoven, by depriving him of his free will. Returned to society as a harmless marshmallow, Alex is trumpeted by the state as the final solution to the problem of crime and lawlessness, but through happenstance falls into the hands of a liberal muckraking writer and his cronies, who plan to use Alex as a martyr for their anti-Establishment cause. Unfortunately, the writer soons recognizes Alex as the young lad who, a few years earlier, had raped and beat his wife, and his desire for vengeance overcomes his devotion to his cause. Finally, Alex again becomes a tool of the Establishment politicians, and as we close out he is converted back into his lovable barbarian self.

A Clockwork Orange is, I suppose, something that appears organic yet is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actually mechanical — this concept can be directly applied to the post-brainwashing Alex, and also to the collectivist society in which he lives. The dividing line between organism and mechanism seems to be free will, a doctrine which runs like a thread throughout the movie — but, to my mind, Alex is as will-less a monstrosity before the treatment as after. Pre- and post-brainwashing, Alex and his world are debased caricatures of humanity; nightmare products of a decaying and dehumanizing technocracy. Indeed, it is a clockwork universe, for there appears to be no aspect of society that does not suppress the individual and his freedom.

The movie itself, unfortunately, is also a clockwork orange, for it suffers from the elaborate plasticity and heavy-handed technology with which Kubrick tries to do justice to Anthony Burgess' brilliant novel. The same infantile fascination with James Bond gimmickry and philosophical pretentiousness that so marred *2001* is present here, but even more hoked up, with sparkling sadism and glittering pornography. To present a forceful display of savagery was Burgess' intent, of course, but the box-office interpretation of Kubrick tends to replace content with flashing lights and gaudy colors — and, when coupled with the mediocre acting of Alex and his droogs, sometimes produces scenes, like the opening at the milk-bar, that should have been left on the cutting-room floor.

Yet we can forgive Mr. Kubrick his tawdry settings, his occasional lapses in taste, for there are so many moments when everything comes together and we have a frightening, powerfully moralistic tale. Alex and his gang walk through the urban rubble of a decadent age which, with its moral decay and its attack on individual freedom and integrity, bears more than a fleeting resemblance to our own. The total disregard for human dignity and the sanctity of life, the absence of any civilized restraints, that characterize the rule of the barbarian have seldom been so chillingly portrayed. The delinquent product of some future counter-culture, Alex is degeneracy epitomized as he takes pleasure only in the most brutalized forms of techno-sensuality. He is perhaps the nadir of human existence — but, like all humanity, appears to have a saving grace, in this case a devotion to Beethoven. Perhaps this twist, left unexplained in both book and movie, is meant to cast a ray of hope on what, despite its faults, must surely be one of the most terrifying visions of the future since the work of Huxley and Orwell.

Kevin S. Olson

CORRESPONDENCE

To The Editor:

The problem of being a Christian in these days of heathenish activity is not lessened by one's being a scientist, which, in this case, one is. Having devoted most of my leisure time to intimate conversations with the Deity, I can only say that we are both extremely displeased with the way humanity is polluting the world with waste heat, noxious chemicals, and sex. The greatest crisis now facing mankind is the problem of generating sufficient electrical power for his sinful needs, and, as we are at the moment ruled by a kind and just God about to condemn us all to eternal torment in adamantine chains and penal fire, as the saying goes, for lousing up his favorite planet, it would be prudent to investigate other sources of power than fossil fuels and/or nuclear energy. Although I suppose it would be asking you heathens a little bit much to expect you to know of the event which I am about to relate, a cautious perusal of the same would be beneficial. How stupid it is for mankind to seek to find new sources of energy when for 3245 years the answer has been easily apparent! God stopped the sun for three hours, or six hours, or something like that. As we now know (it had apparently slipped God's mind at the time) that it is not the sun that moves, it is the earth (first demonstrated by Archimedes); so we must assume that God stopped the earth, thus setting a sort of precedent, a **deus ex machina,** if you will. The earth is quite massive, and, since it is rotating, possesses quite a goodly amount of available energy so stop the earth.

Of course, allowing for human frailty, it would be difficult to stop the earth as effectively as He did, for an imperfect job would result, most probably, in the general displacement of the continents into space, with the resultant great inconvenience to the inhabitants of the same. So it should take about five or six days to completely stop the earth. The problem of tapping this power is easily solved, since it would be fairly easy to boost magnets into orbit, and, as everyone knows, the earth, a rotating magnet in its own right, would cause an electric current of magnificent proportions to be generated; the resulting electricity could be returned to the surface of the earth through the use of storage batteries. Not only is this an extremely natural method of generating almost unlimited amounts of electrical power, but some of the side effects of this action are even more appealing. Were the earth stopped, it is obvious that one side would continuously face the sun, and, I suppose, the other would not. This would be very convenient for those engaged in agriculture, sunbathing, or other daytime activities. On the other hand, the dark side would be perfect for astronomers, photograpic development, and other activities of the nocturnal persuasion, which good taste prohibits me to do more than allude to. Also, from a political standpoint, it would prove most amusing to leave our atheistic Communistic fellowmen in perpetual darkness.

Of course, this method would not provide an eternal source of power, but, as I have been informed, the world may expect the return of Christ on October 31, 1996 at 8:05 GMT, I shall really not care if it proves insufficient for further needs beyond that point. I suppose that if we really needed power in the meantime, we undue leakage in the storage batteries), we could boost magnets into solar orbit and harness the energy generated if we slow the earth's orbital motion enough to cause it to fall into the sun. Of course, most of the energy would have to be stored up, in order to provide adequate air-conditioning services once we reach our destination. Perhaps...

Sincerely yours,
X. Mordecai Kaplan
Claremont Men's College

The Florida Primary

A Note from the Provinces

Jerry Gerde

Prediction One:	Wallace	- 41%
Prediction Two:	Lindsay	- 21%
Prediction Three:	Jackson	- 19%
Prediction Four:	Muskie	- 14%

Down here in the Provinces, things are a-happening.

Florida voters are preparing to dispense both "cold water" and "new mandates" to Democratic Presidential aspirants on March 14th, 1972.

On that date, Sunshine State voters are going to turn "thumbs down" with Roman imperiousness to Muskie's national candidacy; they'll do it by giving him just 14% of the total vote — putting him in fourth place.

And Sunshine State voters, on the other hand, will shock the experts and blow Lindsay's smoldering flame into a full fire by giving him 21% of the vote — a second place finish.

The showings by the other candidates should be only moderately surprising, and of little immediate effect on their respective candidacies. Wallace's 41% will cement his position as a contender, and will set a pattern that will see him arrive in Miami Beach with a substantial commitment of Democratic delegates (whose ultimate disposition may provide the greatest real drama for that convention and Party).

Jackson's third place finish will keep him viable in the horserace, but will be the result of a curious constituency. Jackson's pro-defense position has won the respect of many white Floridians — and, in many non-urban counties, black Floridians are being led to Jackson as part of a county-by-county effort to defeat Wallace by "blocking" the black vote behind the one candidate who is considered able to draw well against Wallace.

Hence:	Chisolm	- 2%
:	Humphrey	- 2%
:	McGovern	- 0.4%
:	Hartke	- 0.1%

The shocker...Lindsay...will draw his constituency from predictable sources: (a) the young; (b) the older; and (c) the black. Young people who love Lindsay's verbal dreams, senior citizens who are not affected by his pro-busing stand, and black voters caught by his catchy phraseology — all will offer support that should together total 21% of Florida's 3,000,000 plus voters.

Things are indeed a-happening down here in the Provinces. Imagine — selling "cold water" and "new mandates" *at the same time* to those Yankee politicians! □

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Whom the gods destroy they first make mad." —Euripides

TIMELESS POLITICAL VALUES

Thinking the unthinkable with Dr. Harriet Van Horne:

I have never met a conservative with sex appeal. Never. Men who grouse about welfare spending and foreign aid and help for ghetto children are always the wallet fumblers when the dinner check arrives. Always. And their spirits are small in ways that suggest cold nights in their boudoir.

Now there may be right-wing conservatives, somewhere in this great land, who are warmblooded, greathearted, kind and gentle. But you find me one — and to quote my tall, blue-eyed father — I'll make you a watch. Men who are warmhearted and tender with women, men who have enough security in their own persons to care about others, tend to be liberal in politics, ardent in love.

Sex appeal, in the final analysis, is a quality of spirit as well as flesh. And I guess that's why I could never vote for Spiro Agnew in the sex appeal poll.

— *New York Post*

RENAISSANCE OF THE 100% 'MERICAN

The executive secretary of the Massachusetts Grocers Association, Citizen Malcom McCabe, gives patriotism a new twist:

The forces of subversion would do anything to destroy the old-fashioned hot dog...A turkey dog, tuna dog or chicken dog must be stopped.

—*Boston Traveller*

INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

The cunning Mary McGrory reports on — among other things — how essential a sure grasp of geography is for success in American politics:

John V. Lindsay, five months a Democrat, almost one month a presidential candidate, came to town to deliver his state of the union message.

"There is a Bangladesh of the spirit in many corners of America," he told the ladies of the Women's National Democratic Club, in the most picturesque, all-inclusive summary of the prevailing view of his new party.

— *Boston Globe*

MALE CHAUVINISM

James Reston lets slip his 19th Century sympathies:

...that other forlorn dream — that women might one day lead us into a more peaceful and considerate world — gets little support from Golda Meir's warrior policy in Israel or from the smiling picture of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, hands folded as in prayer, rejoicing over the military dismemberment of Pakistan.

— *New York Times*

FAITH UNSHAKEABLE

Nina Van Pallandt, renowned folksinger and love goddess, pays obeisance to the people's right to know and renews our faith in Mr. Clifford Irving:

....knowing this man as I do I cannot believe the book is false. I believe it is authentic. I would dearly like to think the book is authentic and that Clifford will prove to the world that it is.

— *London Sunday Mirror*

THE WOMEN'S CRUSADE

A recondite analysis of Mr. Nixon delivered by Dr. Gloria Steinem to an august throng at The National Press Club:

Mr. Nixon is possibly the most sexually insecure Chief of State since Napoleon.

—*The Boston Globe*

POWDER PUFF IDEOLOGY

A superb causal explanation of Mr. Nixon's Vietnam embroglio by that same profound intellect, Gloria Steinem:

To lose face is a culturally masculine problem. The less secure a male, the more he has to prove; the more dangerous a leader he is. Witness Richard Nixon. Perhaps all those years of sitting on the bench watching football players go by have given him an unquenchable thirst to come out Number One. We are paying for that in Indo-China.

— *The Boston Globe*

APPROVED READING

William Appleman Williams proves that when a pedagogue tries his hand at *belles lettres* it can result in a metaphorical orgy that is sheer joy for fun-loving readers:

...it was Johnson rather than Kennedy who moved the system. The Kennedy machine was like a freeway cruiser: beautiful on the way to the White House or the moon, but of little help in getting coal to Grandma in the snow. A full appreciation of Lyndon's contraption, which would make either kind of trip, depends upon an understanding of two of the assumptions behind the Constitution.

— *New York Review of Books*

CLASSICAL HISTORICISM

For those who read *The Nation*, that illustrious historian, Barbara Bellow Watson, rekindles memories of Gibbon, Trevelyan and the great historians of yesteryear, or worse:

The inner history of women before the 20th century is lost, probably forever. What can we know of a tribe that made no laws of its own, left almost no pictures or artifacts, and wrote only a few books — in which important subjects were taboo and every attitude had to be acceptable to another tribe? With rare exceptions, if any, women have been in this sense prehistoric creatures, like a Stone Age people surviving among the space ships, unnoticed just because they are so visible. It is true, of course, that ordinary men are also ignored in the history books. Generals hog the pages as they do the national budget.

— *The Nation*

AUTHENTICITY IN LEFT-LIBERAL GOSSIP

A grim reminder of the strange tricks undiluted ideology can play on the perceptive powers even of the precision journalists at *The Nation*:

After a White House white-tie dinner, that was attended by almost all the luminaries of right-wing America, including Dr. and Mrs. Sidney Hook and Mr. and Mrs. Irving Kristol, the company retired to the East Room for entertainment, to be provided by the Ray Coniff Singers.

—*The Nation*

SONS AND LOVERS

Mr. Donald Armstrong — father of Karleton Lewis Armstrong and Dwight Armstrong, the alleged homicidal bombers — speaks movingly and intelligently of his sons in what surely must be filed as notes on the nurturing of idealists:

You know, I raised my sons well. If they would have been a bunch of hoodlums when they were young, running around the streets, they would never have gotten in serious trouble. If they did this, it is because they have a conscience.

— *New York Times*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTINUING CRISIS

(continued from page 11)

His first challenge comes in New Hampshire where Mr. Nixon is receiving some competition from Congressman John Ashbrook and another fellow. Capital punishment was described as unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court, and in Lagos, Nigeria the Army executed six shoplifters.

● A professorship in peace studies is to be established at Colgate University. At George Washington University two coeds were raped within one-half hour and two Oregon State University girls were similarly treated, while a third was stabbed to death in her dormitory. Yet, though freedom to do one's own thing does seem to be flourishing in some areas of America, the Bill of Rights was shown to be a hollow thing indeed when Ralph Ginzburg — one of the few men in recent American history to actually be convicted of obscenity — began a three-year sentence in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania Federal Penitentiary. □

HACKER

(continued from page 4)

standing. "Relevancy" to these students means action, not insight. Relevant courses, to these students, are workshops for implementing techniques of social and political reform, and that which is not immediately useful in furthering their goals, such as the traditional college curriculum, is condemned as irrelevant.

My answer to this argument is that if "relevancy" means that which aids in implementing a specific cause or ideology, then the college curricula should be irrelevant. A college should allow and even encourage controversy and research on current social and political issues, but if it allows its resources to be used as an instrument to further the political ends of any group, then the college, by committing itself to definite political beliefs, negates a vital condition for free intellectual inquiry, which is the ideologically neutral environment so necessary for open and fruitful discussions on controversial issues.

In conclusion, I give one argument against student power, which I call "The Argument from Professional Relevancy." The argument is: "Decisions concerning requirements for professional qualifications, training in or for a profession, and professional judgments on colleagues should only be made by those in the profession. Therefore, since undergraduates lack professional status, they should not share the professional prerogatives of the faculty." I am in no way advocating infallibility, as it is all too obvious that a goodly number of 'professionals,' both in and out of academia, are incompetents. But, if such professional incompetents exist, as indeed they do, then all the more reason for not allowing non-professional incompetents to share professional power. The principle upon which the premise of my argument is based is that professional matters should be decided by professionals, the presupposition being that the professional is an expert and, hence, there is a greater probability that his decision on professional matters will be sounder than a layman's.

The demand for student power is essentially irrational, as it is the demand for ignorance to preside over knowledge. The extent of the success of the student-power movement is a measure of the weakness of academic professionalism; a weakness, which if not corrected, will destroy the educational efficacy of American colleges. □

"IT WAS AT a post-midnight meeting that Premier Chou En-lai unleashed his anticipated denunciation of the Nixon eight-point peace plan. But of Henry Kissinger, he had no harsh words. Mr. Kissinger, purred Chou, 'has all the characteristics of a man with whom one can argue.' And then silent, he sat back and looked for all the world like a cat who knows where his next canary is coming from, and when."

For a free copy of NATIONAL REVIEW, write: Dept. A, 150 E. 35 Street, N. Y. 10016.

There is opportunity...

MANUFACTURING

Tuner Division
Semi-Conductor Division
Broadcast Equipment Division
Air Trimmer Division
Magnetic Tape Division

NEWSPAPERS

Bloomington Courier Tribune
Lawrence County Topics
Greencastle Banner-Graphic
(Morning and Evening)
Morgan County Gazette

RADIO

WTTS-Bloomington
WTTV-Bloomington
WATI-Indianapolis
WPTH-FM-Ft. Wayne

TELEVISION

WTTV-Bloomington, Indianapolis
WPTA-Roanoke

in America!

SARKES TARZIAN INC.
east hillside drive - bloomington, Indiana -telephone 812-332-7251

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Don't Forget Your Professor!

Think of the dreadful stuff he has to read—scholarly journals, the *New York Review of Books*, notices from John Gardner, reports from faculty committees.

He needs a change. He needs a change that will shake him up and lift him out of his gloom.

Why not send him *The Alternative?* The first number will make him yell, but he will be waiting for the second, and the third will make a new man of him. His lectures will improve. He will begin to forget the revolution.

Enclosed is $..... for .....one-year (nine issues) gift subscriptions ($2.00 for students and faculty members, $4.00 for others).

If you have no professor, then what of the poor graduate student down the street, or the afflicted teaching assistant? Shouldn't they be reading a *good* magazine?

Send to: The Alternative
Circulation Dept.
R.R. 11, Box 360
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

My Name and Address

.....

.....

.....

If you say so we'll tell the Prof. who is sending him the magazine.

Shall we tell him?
YES ( )
NO ( )

Name .....
Address .....
.....**Zip** .....
College or Univ. .....

Name .....
Address .....
.....**Zip** .....
College or Univ. .....

THE ALTERNATIVE
c/o The Establishment
R.R. 11, Box 360
Bloomington, Ind. 47401

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Indianapolis, Indiana
Permit No. 8

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED